

1991

The Corporate Video department : Coping with an Identity Crisis in Changing Times

Darrell J. Cordary Jr.
Ithaca College

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.ithaca.edu/ic_theses



Part of the [Broadcast and Video Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Cordary, Darrell J. Jr., "The Corporate Video department : Coping with an Identity Crisis in Changing Times" (1991). *Ithaca College Theses*. 369.

https://digitalcommons.ithaca.edu/ic_theses/369

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Digital Commons @ IC. It has been accepted for inclusion in Ithaca College Theses by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ IC.

THE CORPORATE VIDEO DEPARTMENT:
COPING WITH AN IDENTITY CRISIS IN CHANGING TIMES

by,
Darrell J. Cordary, Jr.

An Abstract
of a thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of Master of Science
in the School of Communications at
Ithaca College

August 1991

Thesis Advisor: Diane Gayeski

Abstract

This qualitative study addresses the identity crisis that corporate video departments are facing today in America. From depth interviews with five well-published industry leaders in corporate and nonbroadcast video, themes emerged that indicate several keys to the survival and the success of corporate video departments. The themes, including growth, hard times, changing functions, worth, successful traits, organizational placement, personnel, professional association support, and corporate video future are supported by actual interview quotes and are compared to a review of the literature. Finally, the directions for future research provide suggestions for further investigation.

THE CORPORATE VIDEO DEPARTMENT:
COPING WITH AN IDENTITY CRISIS IN CHANGING TIMES

A Thesis Presented to the Faculty
of the School of Communications
Ithaca College

In Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree
Master of Science

by
Darrell J. Cordary, Jr.
August 1991

Ithaca College
School of Communications
Ithaca, New York

CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL

MASTER OF SCIENCE THESIS

This is to certify that the Thesis of

Darrell J. Cordary, Jr.

submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Science in the School of
Communications at Ithaca College has been approved.

Thesis Advisor:

✓

Candidate:

✓

Chair, Graduate
Program in Communications: —

Dean of
Graduate Studies: —

Date:

September 9, 1991

Acknowledgements

My completion of this thesis brings to a close a very stimulating and influential period of graduate study at Ithaca College. I would like to take this opportunity to publicly thank all those who made it possible.

First, I would like to thank three special people who believed in me enough to go that extra yard when they could have taken the easier route and no one would have known. If not for my mentor and friend, Dr. Samuel Kelly, I would not have obtained my undergraduate degree; if not for my graduate advisor and thesis committee member, Dr. Palmer Dyer, I would not have been accepted into Ithaca College; and if not for my thesis advisor, Dr. Diane Gayeski, I would not have completed this thesis. To each of you, a very sincere thank-you for your constant support and guidance.

Thanks also to my other committee member, Dr. Jan Muto, for her sense of humor and for teaching me the meaning of qualitative research.

Thanks to my participants for disclosing their wisdom.

Thanks to my cohort and friend, Shannon Mizell; the best editor in the world, Lori Brasche; and all who supported me at PRC Inc.

Finally, a special thanks to my family, especially my bride/friend/typist, Lynne, and my new baby daughter, Denise, for giving me the strength and determination to accomplish my goals today and in the future.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Acknowledgements	ii
Chapter One: Introduction and Literature Review	1
Introduction	1
Research Goals	2
Review of the Literature: Corporate Video	3
Review of the Literature: Qualitative Research	
Methodology	22
Summary	29
Chapter Two: Research Method and Design	31
The Depth Interview Method	31
The Depth Interview Procedure	34
Participants	38
Aide-Mémoire	42
Data Analysis	45
Theme Analysis	50
Summary	52
Chapter Three: Data Analysis	54
Data Collection Process	54
Emerging Themes	55
Themes	56
Summary	108
Chapter Four: Discussion	109
Literature and the Data	109
Participants' Observations	114
Limitations of the Study	117
Directions for Future Research	119
References	121

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION AND LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

It is commonplace for a corporate video department to influence changes within a company. Many of the departments directly affected by such an in-house capability have experienced the benefits that a corporate video department can offer. But what happens to the video department in changing times - when the company experiences rapid growth, hostile takeover, employee layoffs and/or company mergers?

Through qualitative research, this researcher will analyze the experiences and perspective of five outstanding industry leaders using recorded interviews as the basis for data collection.

This researcher will focus on the survival of the corporate video department by analyzing interview transcripts to determine how the video industry as a whole may be changing and how other video departments have coped with major changes.

Evaluating these changes and how they effect a corporate video department will reveal a clearer understanding and definition of a department's objectives and identity within the ever changing corporate environment.

Research Goals

By observing and analyzing how corporate video is struggling for an identity, this researcher seeks to find those essential elements that are necessary for a successful corporate video department.

Use of qualitative research methods for analyzing the transcribed interviews will realize more than the statistics and relational measures typically obtained from conventional quantitative methods. Qualitative research has been used as a very useful social science research tool when studied "cause and effect" is neither a clear result nor wanted.

The precise type of qualitative research will be a descriptive-explanatory study that aims "both to describe certain aspects of a real population and to investigate causal relations within that population" (Selvin, 1979, p. 237).

This study will evaluate characteristics of the corporate video department, accounting for variations found within the responses of the interviewed participants. The freedom of latitude using this method of research can be stated best by B.F. Skinner, when he wrote "when you run into something interesting, drop everything else and study it" (cited in Isaac and Michael, 1984, p. 226). The ability to investigate and lead away from any stated hypothesis or theory will give this research an unbiased beginning that is needed for such a significant field of study.

Finally, serendipity rather than theory is the art of finding something while you are looking for something else. Therefore, this study should not introduce treatments into controlled or experimental conditions, as in conventional quantitative methods, but should have the freedom to explore opinions and evaluate social conditions that can best be accomplished by qualitative research methods.

Review of the Literature: Corporate Video

Growth

Since television began in the 1930s, it has evolved into more than an entertainment and information medium; it has firmly found a place in corporate America as a viable, often vital, internal communication tool. Video has also had an important impact on how businesses communicate internally and externally and is likely to continue its impact even to affect many other sectors of our society (Stokes, 1988).

Commenting on the fast pace of corporate television in the 1970s and 1980s, "...the actual growth of the private television industry has exceeded our most optimistic predictions" (Brush and Brush, 1986, p. 6).

As Brush and Brush (1986) state:

While the extensive use of private television is less than 20 years old - with most of its development taking place during the last 10 years - many organizations had been using it on an infrequent basis for a much longer period. Almost from the time that television became a commercial medium, various companies

began finding ways of harnessing its power and impact for private communications purposes (p. 15).

Growth in the corporate video industry has been an underlying theme in nearly every book and report written on the subject within the past decade.

As Dranov, Moore, and Hickey (1982) wrote:

The use of video by business and industry has grown steadily over the past decade. Although the rate of growth is difficult to quantify, there is no doubt that video is being used to achieve an increasingly broad range of corporate objectives, from employee training to morale boosting (p. 155).

As Stokes (1988) wrote, "Business and industry comprise one of the fastest developing segments of nonbroadcast user. This growth is not only reflected in sheer numbers, but in the kinds of video applications explored and the types of hardware acquired" (p. 33).

Continuing, Jurek (1989) wrote, "Corporate television is the fastest growing segment of nonbroadcast video. Today, companies that never dreamed of producing a television program are becoming ravenous video users" (p. 41).

The first Brush Report on private television communications, written in 1974, found that more than 300 corporations and other private organizations were involved in private television production and distribution. Additionally, the report identified more than 75 private video networks operating around the country, which, to be considered a network, had to originate programming to five or more geographic locations. The Brushes' latest complete

report, published in 1986, estimates that some 8,500 organizations are producing video for communications and/or training (Brush and Brush, 1974, 1986).

The reasons for growth are as varied as the applications for video; however, there are two determining factors: 1) The communication and training needs, which private television addresses more effectively than any other medium; and 2) the availability of low-cost, easy-to-operate equipment, combined with creative, objective-oriented concepts and production techniques allowing for "cost-effective practicality for most organizations" (Brush and Brush, 1986, p. 7).

As Stokes (1988) states:

The pioneers of this sector were large companies that needed to communicate with many branch offices and factories geographically dispersed throughout the country.... The programs produced by these businesses and industries are as diverse as the companies themselves. However, most programming falls into one of three basic categories: training, communications and marketing (p. 33).

Other industry indicators help demonstrate this growth of the nonbroadcast video industry. Major trade journals are reporting circulations of between 20,000 and 30,000. (Note, not all video users are subscribers.) Video Expo, a leading industry trade show, registers more than 12,000 attendees each year in New York, with thousands of other attendees for shows in Los Angeles, Orlando, and San Francisco. The leading organization for professionals in corporate television - the International Television Association (ITVA)

- also continues to show membership growth. Since its inception one year after the first Brush report in 1974, ITVA has grown from 800 to over 8,000 members, with continued growth every month (Stokes, 1988).

The acceptance of video within private homes greatly influenced the growth and acceptance of video as a communications medium within business and industry. Today's adults have grown up with television and are willing to process information presented via television programming. The growth of consumer-graded VCRs and cameras has enabled the acceptance and lowering of the intimidation factor for hardware purchases by decision-making executives. It is not uncommon for many of these executives to own or to have used consumer gear at home for their own video productions. Another reason for the growth in business and industry is the cost effectiveness of video programming when compared to increased travel cost. By using videotape for program distribution, companies can reduce travel budgets and cut down on time lost by personnel traveling from site to site. Video also ensures that the message remains consistent. Finally, the increased acceptance can be attributed to the creative element attainable with video. "Subjects that would otherwise be dry - and perhaps even too abstract to understand readily - can be brought to life through the medium" (Stokes, 1988, p. 3).

According to Brush and Brush (1986), managers have lived through several management-theories-turned-fads, but the

managing of emerging video into the organization has been different.

When video first came into serious use in many organizations, field managers thought that it, too, was just another "fad" of top management's and that it would soon fade from sight.... One thing that has kept video alive and well and a sure "fit" in any corporate culture is the fact that video from the start was seen as a solution to a definite corporate problem and was supported by top management at its introduction (p. 35).

While most video departments obtained their management support and start within the Training Department, video soon found other applications, particularly internal communications needs (Brush and Brush, 1986).

Technology has been of crucial importance to the growth of the corporate video department because the department serves many uses. And as Schindler (1989) explains:

Corporate video was born in the early Seventies as part of the age of small format television technology. The business world, already experienced in corporate communications via small scale publishing, filmmaking, and photography, caught on quickly. Since that time, the history of corporate video has been propelled by technology development (p. 41).

As Carlberg (1991) comments on the effect that the videocassette had on the growth of corporate video:

The average video manager has a special fondness for the videocassette. After all, that seemingly sterile grayish plastic box made television easy to use for the average corporate employee. No tape to thread, guides to check or "pilot's license" needed to operate it (p. 29).

Although many have written on all the above reasons for growth in the corporate video industry, the sometimes forgotten contributors are people. As Brush and Brush (1974) report, "But the best equipment in the world will not produce a good television program without experienced, creative people to run it. And, at the moment, developing these people is the key to the growth of the business" (p. 13).

Staffing

Proper staffing of the corporate video department is important for its success and growth. As Jurek (1989) states, "The success of nonbroadcast television hinges on the people who produce it. As the technology changes and the need for more communication and training grows, the need for quality communications professionals also grows" (p. 19).

And as Brush and Brush (1974) emphasize:

High-quality programming can only be equated with one thing: the high quality of thinking and creativity that go into producing a show.... To get the level of production staff necessary to fulfill these functions, it is necessary to pay good salaries... (p. 77).

But as Brush and Brush (1977) also note, "No one goes into private television to get rich. The motivation is the medium not the money. Salaries in the industry are determined by the prevailing forces of the local job market..." (p. 90).

A recent survey of salaries prove that salaries range from \$10,000 to \$15,000 for a production assistant to over

\$50,000 as a video department manager or director. The salaries of technicians, engineers, writers, directors and producers typically fall between the \$15,000 - \$50,000+ range (Jurek, 1989).

The staff size of video departments has remained constant for the past eight years. In 1981, the median staff size was 3.5 people. In 1986, it fell to an even 3.0 people. As reported in the last update survey in 1988, staff size had increased to 3.8 people. In terms of percentages, 40 percent experienced staff reduction between 1986-88, while 34 percent experienced an increase (Brush and Brush, 1988).

As Rice (1989) explains:

The whole corporate television industry is in a tumultuous time. There are more companies using video in more aspects than ever before. Within the corporate market, there is a true diversity of individuals. In-house personnel is still driving the market, but independents, be they independent producers and creative people, or production houses and facilities, are making their presence known (p. 8).

Because corporate television is coping with staffing restrictions, freelancing is becoming more viable as an option for video managers and producers. "Freelancing is almost an industry unto itself. Born of necessity, fueled by economics, the freelancer has found the market hard to get into, but...is well worth the effort" (Jurek, 1989, p. 215). Layoffs and takeovers within the broadcast networks and decreased budgets for affiliates flooded a well-trained work force into the corporate or nonbroadcast freelancing market. There are various types of freelancers (order according to

greatest number in a recent ITVA survey): producer, one-person operation, writer, videographer, director, manager, editor, audiovisual specialist, assistant producer, technician, engineer, and production assistant. Many video departments maintain a selected list of freelancers and, in turn, freelancers commonly have two or three major clients and several minor ones (Jurek, 1989).

For the video manager, producer or director, the difference between a complete video staff or a freelance "staff" is a budget line item difference between salaries and contract services. With upper management placing video departments in a hiring freeze, adding staff is a problem. Use of freelancers varies, depending on business growth and opportunity. There is one item to note: overhead cost changes the way one compares the differences between freelance and full-time; full-time staff members cost benefits, space, phones, desks, etc. (Carlberg, 1991).

At times, it has been difficult for the corporate video department to affiliate itself within one department on the corporate organizational chart. As Barr (1990) explains:

The reason: video remains a difficult organizational fit in most companies, often times being shuttled between such departments as training, public relations, corporate communications, advertising and marketing. In many cases, mixing various media for a project may mean traversing tough interdepartmental barriers; very few companies have one central department, delegating and determining how best to use various medias (p. 28).

"One of the most important decisions to make concerning the media department is where it will be placed in the overall corporate structure" (p. 41). For example, if a video department is placed under the training department umbrella, or a certain function of training, it may be perceived only as a training tool. The same is true if one specifies any direct functional responsibilities to a particular department (Marlow, 1989).

As Brush and Brush (1986) recommend:

Where to locate the video function in an organization is a question we are being asked quite often these days. As we have often reported, the trend over the last ten years has been to centralize the video function in the Corporate Communications Department. This is the umbrella for many of the communications and "relations" functions within most organizations.... The rationale is simple. Corporate Communications is - or should be - the information crossroads of the organization (p. 125).

Generally, the best fit for the corporate video department is in a Corporate Communications department because of its proximity to top management. In 1988, 25 percent of the those surveyed said that they reassigned within the last two years. Of those re-assigned, 28 percent moved to Corporate Communications, 24 percent changed to marketing/sales and 24 percent crossed over to HRD/Training (Brush and Brush, 1988).

Costs

"Equating people and dollars sounds heartless...like Scrooge in Dickens' 'A Christmas Carol,' but people are dollars - in salary, benefits, pencils, desks, floor space and heat. And they represent dollars in sales, productivity and cost-saving ideas" (Carlberg, 1991, p. 85).

The corporate video budget is where people and dollars meet on paper and as Marlow (1989) explains, "The success of an organizational media production operation, from an economic point of view, is based on developing a cost-effective in-house media operation and producing media products that provide positive economic results for the organization" (p. 22).

As Carlberg (1991) states:

Business is based on a common denominator: dollars. And, for the video manager, there are always more "wants" than dollars to buy them. In fact, the hardest part of a video manager's job is deciding how to best invest budgeted dollars to do the most for the company (p. 61).

According to Marlow (1989), the budget has three functions: 1) planning future operations, 2) coordinating the organization's activities, and 3) controlling the action of employees.

Corporate video operating budgets, including salaries, facilities, tape stock, duplication, distribution, equipment purchases and maintenance, and outside services, have increased considerably since 1981. The median operating budgets for video departments between 1981 and 1986 have

increased 66 percent and increased another 22 percent in a 1988 survey. The average median budget increase for the past 10 years has been around 10 percent. Inflation has had an effect on this increase, but if the prices of equipment are factored in, the gains are impressive (Brush and Brush, 1986, 1988).

As Dranov, Moore, and Hickey (1982) explain:

A key factor in the cost effectiveness of video is the technology itself.... Newer developments in digital techniques, miniaturization, video disc technology and longitudinal video recording should continue to yield smaller, lighter weight, easier-to-use and less expensive equipment (p. 125).

In the latest update survey by Brush and Brush (1988), some video departments did experience decreases in their operating budgets: "... 17 percent [of the survey repondents] said their 1988 budgets were decreased, with the median decrease reported at ten percent" (p. 20).

A video operation has several ways for budgeting and cost accounting for the functions performed for various clients. Generally there are four budgeting and accounting methods: 1) Full charge-back: all costs for program production are charged to the client; 2) partial charge-back: only direct, out-of-pocket expenses are charged to the client; 3) duplication/distribution charge-back: only the costs attributed to reproducing or distributing the program are charged; and 4) straight budget: an estimate is used to budget for production services and the full amount is charged to the client. Seventy-seven percent of video departments

charge back using one of the above methods, whereas the other 23 percent do not charge users for their services and most use an annual fixed budget to select the video projects that will best serve the company (Brush and Brush, 1986).

As Marlow (1989) states, "With a properly structured annual budget, the media department can flourish and provide management with proof that it is making a contribution to the organization" (p. 23).

Distribution

According to Jurek (1989), "Nonbroadcast video has achieved acceptance as a legitimate means of delivering training, motivational, and informational communications to defined audiences" (p. 4).

The process of delivering the video medium in corporate video is defined as a video network or a distribution system which, as a rule, carries programming to six or more locations from the point of origination. Using this rule as a guideline, nearly all of departments surveyed in 1988 had a video network in place, while only 62 percent were so equipped in 1973. The number of employee viewing locations continues to grow once networks are in place. The same survey reports that the median number of locations is 113 compared to only 8 locations in 1973 (Brush and Brush, 1988).

According to Brush and Brush (1986):

Video is always more successful when it is used to produce and deliver programs covering a variety of applications since it usually

requires an organization to make two basic commitments. One is to invest in some form of playback or program distribution system.... The other commitment is to assign a person to function, even on a part-time basis, as an in-house video producer (p. 60).

Brush and Brush (1977, 1986, 1988) found that the applications for video programming, that is, the greatest user of these video networks, have changed in the past two decades. In 1973, the reported largest use or need for corporate video programming was in sales training. In 1981, the largest user was in skills training, and by 1988 the number one use for corporate video was in employee information. Simply summarized, "With all of the corporate changes taking place, management now realizes that in times of duress well-informed employees are perhaps the best friends management can have" (Brush and Brush, 1988, p. 7).

Current Practices, Principles, and Trends

In order to determine what is current, one must be able to accurately collect data on the corporate video world for close examination. But Brush and Brush (1986) state that this becomes increasingly difficult. In 1973, everyone in the video business knew who all the corporate video users were, and since most users were large enough to use their own equipment, estimating dollar investments was easy. Where once, one could simply count studios, now field production and outside services make it almost impossible to define what a studio is, let alone count them. And the blurring of the lines between consumer, corporate/industrial and broadcast

equipment has presented problems in determining an accurate picture of what is spent in the area of corporate television.

Upon examination of the principles learned in corporate video, Brush and Brush (1986) write:

In organizations which have been using video successfully over a long period of time, you'll find that it is a *planned* activity.... Publications, newsletters, bulletin boards, A/V presentations, audiocassettes even purchased advertising and sales promotion materials prepared for external use, all work together to achieve clearly stated, previously determined objectives (p. 36).

Carlberg (1991) agrees, but with this thought: Don't just sit in the office and think only of video. "Executives want people who think about the organization and how video can help as much of the organization as possible, not just a small, isolated part of it." (p. 151). It is a can do, whatever-it-takes attitude that will mean survival for the video department.

The perception of using video as a "fix-all" communication tool creates a risk to video departments that have obtained success in other areas such as training. As Carlberg (1991) explains, "The message is pretty simple: Make certain that video is doing the jobs that need video. Don't be a useless function. If you can, spread your risk to insure success" (p. 28).

Brush and Brush (1986) explain that the best use of video stems from "conveying the communications associated with the human face" (p. 69). As Brush and Brush (1986) continue, "Every study we have conducted as well as those

conducted by others say that employees want to hear company policy directly from the people who set it. They want to get key policy information directly from 'the horse's mouth' " (p. 69) .

Certainly video solves a wide variety of communication problems, and compared to face-to-face contact, it is the most direct method of communication. As Brush and Brush (1977, 1988) disclose, the number of programs produced by the video department has risen considerably since 1977, where the median was 21 programs. In 1986 the number was 31 but has decreased and leveled off in 1988 to 30. "The leveling off of the program production numbers reaffirms...that the tendency in organizations today is to be more selective with their use of video programs" (1988, p. 9) .

The number of programs is not the only notable change. The median length of video programs is decreasing to 17 minutes. As Brush and Brush (1988) explain:

...we have noticed a trend in some organizations to produce short, single topic "video memos".... We see this trend continuing because these shorter modules are better suited to viewing in field locations as a part of a local meeting or presentation than are longer, more fully produced programs (p. 74) .

Jurek (1989) states that "while 'downsizing' of some departments and even elimination has occurred, the value of the industry is no longer in dispute. Economic downturns, corporate takeovers, and some genuine managerial ineptness have sidetracked the growth of some nonbroadcast departments" (p. 14) .

As Marlow (1989) states:

It is also clear that video has grown as a corporate communications tool. But the economic realities of the 1980s and (presumably) the 1990s have changed the nature of so-called corporate video operations. A visible number have been shut down, many have been down-sized. A few have turned to external clients for business....Apparently many corporations are using external resources more frequently to realize their video communications product (p. ix).

In fact, mergers, downsizing, and other reorganizational changes have affected the staff services of corporate America, including video. Two-thirds of the video departments surveyed reported that their company and their video department services had undergone significant changes between 1986 and 1988. The changes in video services typically fell into four categories: 1) Full charge-back system adopted, 2) independent profit center established, 3) disbanded or divestiture to form an independent business, or 4) cut-backs with "do more with less" as the corporate directive (Brush and Brush, 1988, p. 5).

With this "do more with less" directive from upper management, Carlberg (1991) writes that a "shirt-sleeves supervisor" is becoming a survival concept. "A 'shirt-sleeves supervisor' sets the pace for the rest of the group. Instead of directing others to work at a certain rate, the supervisor lives the workstyle as an example to others" (p. 86).

Advanced technology has transformed the world of corporate video specialist into video "generalist."

According to Carlberg (1991), "Another current trend is to place increasing value on people who can handle a variety of tasks.... The most successful facilities I surveyed for this book have a core group of video professionals who are 'generalists' " (p. 87).

Advancements in presentation techniques have placed typical video applications such as training, employee information, marketing, or product introduction to other internal corporate organizations. Soseman (1990) states:

Thus, the territory that was once claimed as the video department's domain, video production and impressive program creation, is now public domain. Two of the groups that "are vying for control of the magic" are telecommunications with videoconferencing responsibilities and desktop computer graphics with their multimedia presentations (p. 4).

As Mulligan (1986) sums up current practices, principles and trends:

Over all, I see a speeding up of progress. The environment has changed in many places. The economic forces that "leaned up" the American corporations and organizations also have created a new respect for the value of organizational television. While video can be a cost saver, more importantly it can take limited resources (the new lean management staff) and spread them consistently to a large number of people (p. 3).

Future

"In an era of social and technological change, media managers must be aware of both emerging communications technologies and social trends, and how they will change the

nature of the corporate media operation" (Marlow, 1989, p. 155).

As Brush and Brush (1986) state:

With the avalanche of new technologies, the most important thing for anyone in any area of communications to consider is that the control of the communications process is shifting rapidly from sender to receiver. That is, many of the new technologies enable the receiver - rather than the sender - to initiate the communications process (p. 24)!

As the world rapidly becomes digital, we may one day use our office computer workstation to access full-motion, color video programming and display it directly on our computer screen. Company-wide video-based messages, dial-up access to libraries for training programs, live videoconferencing - the possibilities are endless. And if video becomes digital data, who will have control? "What's happening in video teleconferencing is a prime example" (Brush and Brush, 1986, p. 27).

As for future video applications, Brush and Brush (1986) list the top five in order as follows: News programs, employee information, employee orientation, employee benefits, and management development. Management development and an unmentioned application - community relations - have recently risen in rank. Video applications for community relations are increasing due to the use of video for community, civic, school, and church groups rather than conventional slide presentations (Brush and Brush, 1986, 1988).

When asked about the survival of video, Brush and Brush (1988) answer:

Yes there is a future, but not one which many of us may recognize. The future is not going to be built on past experiences and growth patterns. Corporate video is going to be radically different from now on (p. 27).

The future as described by Stokes (1988):

Overall, the future for nonbroadcast video looks bright. There will, of course, continue to be organizations that fail in their efforts to use the technology, either as a result of poor planning or execution. Video is not an endeavor that can be taken lightly; it requires significant commitment of time and money if it is to succeed within an organization. Properly handled, of course, video can become almost as important to a company's operation as its photocopy machines (p. 123).

Carlberg (1991) describes the responsibilities that a manager must follow to survive the future:

First among your responsibilities is keeping up-to-date on the climate of industry and the "business weather" that climate may bring (p. 165).... Don't put limits on yourself. Don't let someone else limit you. Don't cling to the past as your hope for survival. Manage the facility as if you owned it (p. 168).

And finally, "The art of future-gazing is based, largely, on perceptions of the present. The only thing wrong is that this does not take into account the unexpected. One new product can alter the face of the industry considerably" (Brush and Brush, 1977, p. 136).

Review of the Literature: Qualitative Research Methodology

Part of the problem with current research lies in the restrictiveness of discipline-based research. The restrictiveness stems from a tendency to support specific and focused research paradigms, studies of particular and well-defined research topics, and the use of methodologies which are far too limited and conventional (Cochran and Dolan, 1984).

It is the latter, the use of limited and conventional methodologies, that surfaced repeatedly to argue the reasons and support for qualitative research. Before listing the advantages of qualitative research, first a few definitions must be provided.

Any definition of qualitative research methodology must begin by defining each word separately to search for a collective meaning. Quality, the root of qualitative, is defined as the essential character or nature of something. Qualitative refers to the meaning characterizing something, and the techniques termed qualitative are intended to determine "what things exist" then to determine how many things there are (Walker, 1985; Bogdan and Taylor, 1975; Cochran and Dolan, 1984). Methodology refers to the fundamental assumptions and characteristics of a human science perspective or simply the "pursuit of knowledge" (Manen, 1990, p. 28).

And finally the collective qualitative research methodologies refer to research procedures that produce descriptive data through the use of personal interviews and observable behavior (Bogdan and Taylor, 1975).

Additionally Bogdan and Taylor (1975) write:

Qualitative methods allow us to know people personally and to see them as they are developing their own definitions of the world. We experience what they experience in their daily struggles with their society.... Finally, qualitative methods enable us to explore concepts whose essence is lost in other research approaches (p. 4).

To support the growing disenchantment with conventional or quantitative studies currently conducted, Van Maanen (1982) writes:

The sources of disenchantment are many, but deserving of passing note are: the relatively trivial amounts of explained variance, the abstract and remote character of key variables, the lack comparability across studies, the failure to achieve much predictive validity, the high level of technical and notational sophistication rendering many research publications incomprehensible to all but a highly trained few... (p. 13).

Although "qualitative research has gotten bad press for the wrong reasons and good press for the wrong reasons" (Kirk and Miller, 1986, p. 71), there is an important place for qualitative research in its own right. According to Walker (1985), "Qualitative research reaches parts that other techniques don't. What qualitative research can offer the policy maker is a theory of social action grounded on the experiences - the world view - of those likely to be affected

by a policy decision or thought to be part of the problem"
(pp. 18-19).

Walker (1985) further explains that:

Because qualitative techniques are not concerned with measurement they tend to be less structured than quantitative ones and can therefore be made more responsive to the needs of respondents and to the nature of the subject matter. Typically qualitative methods yield large volumes of exceedingly rich data obtained from a limited number of individuals and whereas the quantitative approach necessitates standardised data collection, qualitative researchers exploit the context of data gathering to enhance the value of the data (p. 3).

Qualitative researchers are coming "out of the closet" and are less apologetic in presenting their research and findings as precursors to the traditionally designed and accepted method of quantitative number-crunching studies undertaken to verify theory based on qualitative methods (Van Maanen, 1982, p. 13). Still other quantitative researchers are becoming dissatisfied with the value of research gained by null-hypothesis testing and search for ways of studying something that will yield many kinds of knowledge, and they are becoming concerned with research diversity (Cochran and Dolan, 1984).

As Moran (1986) explains:

I have never seen an "Aha!" emerge from a regression model....Within the research fraternity, however, I believe it more often is the qualitative researcher who strains to locate an integrating and explanatory "Aha!" amid the welter of messy facts, figures, and anecdotes. Too many quantitative researchers are content to regard descriptive data as ends in themselves (p. RC-17).

As Das (1983) also explains:

Qualitative research methodology combines the rational with the intuitive approach to knowledge; the focus in many qualitative studies typically is on the unfolding of process rather than the structure. Qualitative approaches lend themselves better to the production of serendipitous findings and are in many cases broader and more holistic in perspective than quantitative tools (p. 301).

The clash between quantitative and qualitative researchers was caused greatly by the way generators of theory in the late 1930s used qualitative data in a nonsystematic and nonrigorous way together with their own logic and common sense. "Qualitative research was to provide quantitative research with a few substantive categories and hypothesis" (Glaser and Strauss, 1967, p. 15). "One explanation was that you first conduct qualitative [research] to draw hypothesis and then you conduct a quantitative study to support or not support these hypotheses - the classical two-step study" (Tauber, 1987, p. 7). In the 1930s, advocates of qualitative data believed these data were their media and the qualitative method was the only way to obtain data on many areas not available by traditional quantitative data collection techniques (Glaser and Strauss, 1967).

"An altogether different perspective on the role of qualitative methods is provided by the market research community whose contribution to the development of qualitative techniques has been substantial" (Walker, 1985,

p. 17). But the contribution of market research is often overlooked by academia researchers as simply "trade" (p. 17).

Walker (1985) also states:

Whether qualitative techniques are considered a sufficient basis for scientific description or explanation or whether they offer merely a prelude to scientific enquiry ultimately depends on the philosophical stance taken with respect to the nature of social science (p. 3).

Qualitative interviewing and the type of information gained through it is quite different and impossible to obtain from a structured (quantitative) questionnaire. Likewise, structured quantitative research provides a different type of information. Therefore, the basic difference between qualitative and quantitative research is the method of interviewing (Tauber, 1987).

Techniques used in qualitative research are quite varied. Examples include: participant observation, content analysis, formal and informal interviewing, videotaping, the discovery and use of unobtrusive measures, life history construction, archival data surveys and historical analysis, to name just a few. Often, qualitative research is easily identified by the use of multiple sources of data and the use of several data gathering techniques (Van Maanen, 1982).

Certain principles of qualitative methods carried out by a researcher are described by Van Maanen (1982) as follows:

- 1) Analytic Induction: Qualitative work begins with close-up, detailed observation....
- 2) Proximity: Importance is placed on concrete occurrences and occasions, not on reports of such....
- 3) Ordinary

Behavior: Topics for qualitative study are to be located within the natural world of those studied....4) Structure as Ritual Constraint: Recurrent patterns of social activity are essentially arbitrary, a result of custom, present circumstance, and ongoing interaction....5) Descriptive Focus: ...qualitative work seeks a description for what is occurring in a given place and time (p.16).

Participant observation is referred to as research developed over a period of time in which the observer seeks to study the lives or society of subjects in their natural environments. The degree of immersion in the lives of the people and the situations the researcher wishes to study vary from that of an observer to a complete participant. In the role of an observer, the researcher keeps detailed notes and is sure not to disturb whatever he/she would want to see occur naturally (Bogdan and Taylor, 1975).

The principal difference between the researcher as member and as observer is that as observer he/she has a conceptual framework and associated operations function for a different order of work than that of a participant who shares much of the social life and relations with the group that is observed (Schatzman and Strauss, 1973).

As Walker (1985) explains further:

Almost invariably observation alone is insufficient to satisfy the researcher. Other techniques including surveys, informal interviews, photographs and documents may be used alongside observation.... The art of the researcher lies in his ability to integrate these different methods and their various data (p. 6).

Another method for qualitative research is the depth interview "in which the researcher encourages the informant to relate, in their own terms, experiences and attitudes that are relevant to the research problem" (Walker, 1985, p. 4).

Using the depth interview method the interviewer is not limited to a rigid list of questions, but will have a common platform of background information in which to pull questions from, therefore allowing for follow-up questions in response to interesting ideas introduced by the informant. The degree of structure depends on the topic, the informant and the personal style of the interviewer. Depth interviews are normally recorded and transcribed for analysis (Walker, 1985).

As Schatzman and Strauss (1973) add:

However disappointing an interview may have seemed, it can be resumed at another time. For this reason, the researcher rarely concludes the interview with a simple "thank you, and goodbye"; he tells the respondent he has much to digest and think about, and that in this process he will probably find it necessary to call on him again (p. 74).

Qualitative research, like other research methods, must adhere to certain styles or phases. According to Kirk and Miller (1986) qualitative research is a four-phases affair as follows:

Invention denotes a phase of preparation, or research design; this phase produces a plan of action. Discovery denotes a phase of observation and measurement, or data collection; this phase produces information. Interpretation denotes a phase of evaluation, or analysis; this phase produces understanding. Explanation denotes a phase of

communication, or packaging; this phase produces a message (p. 60).

The rules of qualitative research are simple, but all four phases must figure in the research, and phases cannot substitute for one another (Kirk and Miller, 1986).

Summary

Corporate video departments are affected by the changes occurring in corporate America, such as hostile takeovers, employee layoffs and company mergers. This study uses qualitative research to determine how the corporate video department copes with these changes.

The corporate video industry has experienced rapid growth, yet the corporate video department staff sizes have either stayed constant or have been completely eliminated in the last 10 years. In order to provide added personnel for growing workloads, corporate video managers are using cost-effective free-lancers to satisfy their staffing requirements.

The future for corporate video is uncertain; perhaps the next video technology -- digital video -- will ignite the industry once again. But until then, survival is the object of the game.

Current research methods are too restrictive and have caused the increase in use of less limited and confining qualitative methods. Historical background was used to define the use of and applications for qualitative research. Through comparative measures between qualitative and

quantitative research, it was demonstrated how effective qualitative research was for original theory generation and interview techniques. Often, qualitative research was the only practical field research method. In addition, the chapter concluded with two common qualitative methods - participant observation and depth interview - as well as the four-phase approach to proper qualitative research. Chapter 2 will continue with a further investigation of depth interview as a qualitative method of research and a detailed plan for data analysis.

Chapter 2

RESEARCH METHOD AND DESIGN

This chapter begins with the method for data collection and concludes with the method and design chosen for data analysis. As mentioned earlier, the method selected for data collection is the depth interview method. This chapter includes the definition and proper use of this method. Also included is an overview of the constant comparative method chosen for use as the data analysis technique.

The data collection technique and data coding procedures are outlined along with detailed guidelines for their use. The data collection sample consists of five participants in the subject area of corporate video. Their varied backgrounds and reasons for inclusion in the study are also described in this chapter.

The Depth Interview Method

As Walker (1985) states, "The depth interview is a conversation in which the researcher encourages the informant to relate, in their own terms, experiences and attitudes that are relevant to the research problem" (p. 4). The process of one person seeking to interview another "in depth" is an important tool in social research. As Jones (1985) states, "Indeed the interview is so integral to social research, its prime currency, talk, so central in our social lives, that its complexity as a social interaction can sometimes be

forgotten or obscured" (p. 45). In fact, according to Cantor (1987), "Almost all social scientists have used interviews as either a primary or secondary means of collecting data" (p. 256). As Jones (1985) explains:

In order to understand why persons act as they do we need to understand the meaning and significance they give to their actions. The depth interview is one way - not the only way and often used most appropriately in conjunction with other ways - of doing so (p. 46).

The depth interview - also known as an unstructured interview - is a form of open-ended interviewing where subjects or participants are asked to give their response to a variety of questions.

On the other hand, the quantitative method of interviewing, also referred to as a structured or systematic interview, is characterized by asking each participant the same set of questions, as in a written questionnaire (Weller and Romney, 1988). "Thus, interviews in which interviewers have prepared a long list of questions which they are determined to ask, come what may, over a period of say an hour and a half, are not depth interviews" (Jones, 1985, p. 46), and constitute a more structured type of interview.

Van Maanen (1982) states, "Interviewing is quickly responsive to the investigator's decisions to move between more to less focused types of questions" (p. 81-82).

But according to Jones (1985), "There is no such thing as a totally unstructured interview and the term is overused and often carelessly used....Nor is it simply that the

interview is a 'conversation with a purpose' initiated and guided by the researcher" (p. 47).

Manen (1990) agrees:

Too often a beginning researcher enthusiastically goes about "interviewing subjects" using the so-called "unstructured or open-ended interview method" without first carefully considering what interest the interview is to serve. One needs to guard against the temptation to let method rule the question, rather than the research question determining what kind of method is most appropriate for its immanent direction (p.66).

Researchers that use qualitative methods requiring unstructured interviews are warned to avoid several issues- "question wording, bias, rapport, and avoiding loaded questions" (Burgess, 1984, p. 119). As Cantor (1987) states, "Respondents are prone to tell interviewers what they think they want to hear. Interviewers must also take care not to transpose any information given to fit their own preconceptions of their subjects' theoretical orientations, prejudices, and world views" (p. 256). The idea that if one researches with a preconceived set of hypotheses, the participant's viewpoint will be lost. The term "presuppositionless research" is used to describe this idea (Anderson, 1987, p. 246).

Yet according to Jones (1985):

...there is no such thing as presuppositionless research. In preparing for interviews researchers will have, and should have, some broad questions in mind, and the more interviews they do and the more patterns they see in the data, the more they are likely to use this grounded understanding to want to

explore in certain directions rather than others (p. 47).

Here the advantages of unstructured interviews are clearly recognized when Anderson (1987) writes:

We can contrast this approach with that of, say, a survey where the researcher must assume that the meanings are ideology embedded within the questions [that] are shared by the respondents. In a survey, the researcher's meanings are the only meanings permitted to appear (p. 246).

Burgess (1984) finds that, "Researchers need constantly to monitor the direction, depth, and detail of the interview, the topics to include and topics to avoid, together with question order (p. 120). According to Bogdan and Taylor (1975), "There are certain questions which are too sensitive to ask until the observer has won the confidence of subjects, and the only way for the observer to know which issues are especially sensitive is to sit back and listen" (p. 57). Manen (1990) agrees:

Interview material that is skimpy and that lacks sufficient concreteness in the form of stories, anecdotes, examples of experience, etc., may be quite useless, tempting the researcher to indulge in over-interpretations, speculations, or an over-reliance on personal opinions and personal experiences. In contrast, an over abundance of poorly managed interviews may lead to total despair and confusion ... or to a chaotic quest for meaning (p. 67).

Depth Interview Procedure

So far, only the definition and some of the issues of conducting depth interviews have been addressed. The researcher must now examine the procedures for proper

interviewing by focusing on rules and method. Manen (1990) states, "there are general psychological and journalistic procedures for making sure that the interview will yield information that will be useful for preparing a research report" (p. 28).

In projects using depth or unstructured interviews, an open relationship must be established early with the participant in an attempt to elicit honest feedback. According to Burgess (1984), "In any project involving unstructured interviews the relationship between the researcher and those who are researched is crucial. Usually it is assumed that this relationship is established by the researcher" (p.107). And as Jones (1985) emphasizes:

If we as researchers want to obtain good data it would be better that the persons we are interviewing trust us enough to believe that we will not use the data against them, or that we will not regard their opinions as foolish... (p. 51).

An interview usually begins by reviewing - with the participant - an agenda of topics for discussion. However there is no requirement to cover all the topics in their interview. The researcher continues the interview by explaining the aims of the interview, asking for permission to tape-record for an accurate record of what will transpire allowing for freedom to ask for further clarification of any points, and then by asking them whether they wish to participate (Burgess, 1984).

Once the interview is underway, the researcher must regard the interview as a lengthy conversation. The length of the interview, its probable prearrangement, and its location are no excuse for contrived formality. The way in which the researcher probes for detail, clarity, explanation, and even their gestures, also helps to conduct the interview. "A tactical error is made when the researcher smiles or laughs when the interviewee is dead serious; but equally is he in error when he fails to catch intended humor" (Schatzman and Strauss, 1973, p. 72). In order to assist the researcher, a tape recorder can make note taking easier, as Anderson (1987) states:

For the analyst (researcher) the interview is an improvisational performance requiring good skill. This is a time to use a recorder to preserve the response and to use the note pad as a device for listening carefully. As the informant replies, the analyst should be jotting down names, descriptive phrases, issues identified, and so on. Subsequent questions should come from these notes....The notes provide an index to the tape and are a handy way of comparing interviews on the same subject with different informants (p. 330).

At times during the interview, the respondent may miss important cues that plead for briefer answers. The researcher may have to take action by possibly giving a gesture with his/her hands to attract attention or find a point in which to properly intervene. Experienced interviewers have several "tactical measures for handling 'difficult' respondents: ways of stimulating the inarticulate, loosening the tongue-tied, steering the

'runaways'" (Schatzman and Strauss, 1973, p. 73). A host of vocal gestures are used as tactics, such as "...and then?; when was that?; I don't quite understand; but you said earlier..., ...why?;how come?" (Schatzman and Strauss, 1973, pp. 73-74). The ultimate goal is to have your respondent communicate his/her experience clearly, concisely, and with true meaning. Simple "yes" and "no" responses do not make for interesting data analysis.

As Anderson (1987) states:

Finally, the interview is a field experience like any other. It requires the analyst to prepare observation and field notes. The conditions of the interview, what the informant was trying to accomplish in his or her performance, and what the analyst was attempting should all be noted (p. 330).

Anderson (1987) advises to have the audio tape transcribed, if the costs are not prohibitive, as soon as possible. It is also important to indicate on the transcripts anything "made significant by the speaker or the audience, affected or intentional speech patterns or accent, deliberate pauses both vocalized and silent, notable emphasis, and the like. Transcriptions, therefore, always involve judgement" (p. 334). These notes become important when you need to later verify the accuracy of the intended meaning within the transcriptions.

In the current research project, the interviews will be transcribed with the use of computers. According to Lindlof and Meyer (1987):

Computers, of course, have the enormous capacity for storage, retrieval, and editing of data files....Once data are collected, the computer comes in handy as an organizing tool - coding, cross-referencing, merging, and modifying data bases to arrange elements in different combinations....In short, the computer offers qualitative researchers staggering control over volumes of data and can be used in a variety of productive ways (p. 20).

Anderson (1987) adds:

Microcomputer technology, particularly with the more advanced machines and software, is becoming a great aid to field studies....the electronic wizard can multiply copies at will, split them electronically into various parts, and then code and file them on disk. The codes can be sorted by the machine and called up as needed (p. 344).

Participants

The selection of participants for depth interviewing is critical and the selection process should be evaluated carefully. According to Morton-Williams (1985), "Decisions regarding the composition of the sample for a qualitative study emerge from the objectives and are modified by considerations governing choice of method and the scope of the study" (p. 30).

For this research, five individuals have been selected on the basis of their varied backgrounds and knowledge of corporate video. As Morton-Williams (1985) explains:

Sample design in qualitative research is usually purposive; that is, rather than taking a random cross section of the population to be studied, small numbers of people with specific characteristics, behavior or experience are selected to facilitate broad comparisons

between certain groups that the researcher thinks likely to be important (p. 30).

All of the participants are experienced professionals within the corporate video industry. All of the participants have also authored books or articles on their experiences, insights, and studies about the corporate video field. This study's review of the literature on corporate video could not have been written if it were not for the written viewpoints by these participants and their collective current viewpoints on how corporate video has survived in changing times.

Most of the participants know each other, primarily by their writings and a common affiliation with ITVA, yet all have taken a different path to their unique functions and identities within corporate video.

The participants were carefully chosen on the basis of both their unique backgrounds and because they are established and respected authors in the field of corporate and nonbroadcast television. Through their published writings, the participants' views and opinions continue to guide professionals and students in the field of corporate video.

A brief background is provided for the participants in order to demonstrate the attributes and qualities that they bring to this research project.

John Rice currently heads a consulting and communication company that specializes in video production, program development, marketing and business consulting, and writing.

Prior to forming Rice Communications, he was publisher/editorial director of *Videography* and *Corporate Television* magazines – two leading publications in the professional video field. Rice has an extensive knowledge of the professional and consumer video fields and has written over 200 articles on video equipment and production for a number of trade and consumer publications. He currently has an on-going monthly column in *Videography*, is active in the area of high-definition television, and is completing his second book on the subject.

Scott Carlberg, upon graduation from Western Illinois University with a master's degree in television, began work in 1975 for Phillips Petroleum as a producer/director. As Phillips grew in the late 1970s and early 1980s, so too did Carlberg's career, as he became the video department's supervisor. As the company experienced severe budget cut-backs and layoffs (from 37,000 employees in 1981 to less than 21,000 today), Carlberg's department survived and maintained a strong presence in the company.

Carlberg has recently written a book entitled Corporate Video Survival that provides an in-depth guide to his survival techniques and practices. Carlberg is not currently working within the corporate video field, but he has stayed in touch with today's corporate video department struggle.

Eugene Marlow is founder and president of Media Enterprises and co-founder of a sister company, ME/II Productions, Inc. In the last 18 years he has produced over 500 video, radio, multi-image, videodisc and teleconferencing presentations. He has received over 40 awards from a variety of national and international organizations for programming excellence.

Marlow has held executive media production positions with Citibank, Prudential Insurance and Union Carbide Corporation. He has also authored several books including Corporate Television Programming, Managing Corporate Media, and Communications and the Corporation as well as several other video-related handbooks. Since 1974, he has published over 80 articles on broadcast television programming and video technologies and is currently teaching at Bernard M. Baruch College (City University of New York).

For over 20 years, Judith and Douglas Brush have worked as corporate video consultants to major corporations, advertising agencies, public relations firms, government agencies and the broadcast media. Their firm, D/J Brush Associates, specializes in identifying communication problems and developing solutions for them. By working with senior and executive managers, the Brushes have gained a unique insight into the corporate communications problems facing American business.

In addition, the Brushes have published The Brush Reports, which are based on their nationwide studies of new communication technologies used by business, government and nonprofit organizations. The Brushes also plan and conduct communication seminars and are frequent contributors to professional journals. Both Judith and Douglas Brush teach at the Marist College Lowell Thomas Communications Center in Poughkeepsie, New York. The Brushes are currently researching the newly emerging field of desktop video (DTV) and are expected to update the video industry with this and other survey findings in their upcoming Brush Report.

Aide-Mémoire

The depth interview, by design, begins with the researcher developing a few questions or topics for discussion or an aide-mémoire. As Burgess (1984) explains:

At the start of each interview I explained that I had an 'agenda' which included topics or themes that I would like to cover in our discussion. This agenda acted as an aide [-] mémoire which I could use to ensure that similar topics were covered in all interviews (p. 108).

For the current study, the following was the agenda for the interviewed participants:

- 1) How is today's corporate video department changing?
How do you view these changes?

- 2) Can you identify the characteristics of a successful corporate video department, and what makes those characteristics successful?
- 3) If you were to establish a new in-house video capability in a corporation today, which department would be ideal for the capability? What department would be the least favorable? Why?
- 4) What should the function of a corporate video department be?
- 5) Do you think the video industry supports the success of corporate video? Why or why not?
- 6) What has been the single largest growth factor for corporate video and the largest detriment?
- 7) What comparisons can you make which best describe the growth pattern of corporate video?
- 8) In terms of stages of development, where is corporate video today? Briefly describe why.
- 9) Do corporate video industry professional associations and support organizations (ie., ITVA) offer sufficient leadership? Why or why not.

probe- Are industry standards set by equipment manufacturers or by professional industry committees?

probe- Can the dynamics of large professional associations deal well with rapid changes in technology?

- 10) Do you think that corporate video personnel are adequately trained to cope with the current corporate environment?

probe- How and where do you see them getting this training?

probe- Are they trained to effectively use current technology or is technology becoming too advanced for even the broadest "generalist"?

- 11) Try to envision the corporate video department in the year 2001 - What is the department's title and what are its major functions?

probe- What can the corporate video department do to prepare for this future?

Although there were prepared questions and probes, the interviews were completely unstructured and participants were encouraged to explore new topics and give opinions on related issues.

Data Analysis

Data analysis of depth interviews is defined as the technique or process that entails an effort to formally identify themes and hypotheses as they are suggested by the data, normally in the form of hundreds, or even thousands, of pages of recorded statements (Bogdan and Taylor, 1975, Jones, 1985). To facilitate the process of identifying themes, the current study borrows several techniques used for generating theory. In no way does the current study attempt or imply as its goal the generation or exploration of theory development.

"Without competent analysis, the yield from a rich crop of data may be negligible" (Walker, 1985, p. 180).

As Jones (1985) states:

The analysis of qualitative data is a highly personal activity. It involves processes of interpretation and creativity that are difficult and perhaps somewhat threatening to make explicit. As with depth interviewing there are no definite rules to be followed by rote and by which, for example, two researchers can ensure that they reach identical conclusions about a set of data (p. 56).

Walker (1985) explains the differences between qualitative and quantitative analysis, "Analysis of qualitative material is more explicitly interpretive,

creative and personal than in quantitative analysis, which is not to say that it should not be equally systematic and careful" (p. 3). Anderson (1987) stresses how important inductive methods are to qualitative research and data analysis:

The analyst's responsibility is to provide an interpretation from the member's viewpoint. To do so, the analyst must first discover and, then, adopt that viewpoint. If one investigates social action with a preconceived set of interpretive templates...the member's viewpoint will be lost (p. 246).

As Jones (1985) states:

The analysis of qualitative data is a process of making sense, of finding and making a structure in the data and giving this meaning and significance for ourselves, and for any relevant audiences....As with depth interviewing, therefore, my starting point is a concern to understand the world of the research participant's as they construct it (p. 56).

Once you answer the question, "how good are the data?" (Walker, 1985, p. 185), the point of theory conceptualization begins by sorting like data. As Glaser and Strauss (1967) state, "The sociologist should also be sufficiently theoretically sensitive so that he can conceptualize and formulate a theory as it emerges from the data. Once started, theoretical sensitivity is forever in continual development" (p. 46).

Glaser and Strauss (1967) also state:

These sources for developing theoretical sensitivity continually build up in the sociologist an armamentarium of categories and hypotheses on substantive and formal levels. This theory that exists within a sociologist

can be used in generating his specific theory if, after study of the data, the fit and relevance to the data are emergent. A discovered, grounded theory, then, will tend to combine mostly concepts and hypotheses that have emerged from the data with some existing ones that are clearly useful (p. 46).

"Potential theoretical sensitivity is lost when the sociologist commits himself exclusively to one specific preconceived theory...for then he becomes doctrinaire and can no longer 'see around' either his pet theory or any other" (Glaser and Strauss, 1975, p. 46).

Dabbs (1982) used an example to illustrate how the data collection environment continuously changes, and the example also fits well for theoretical sensitivity. "A photography instructor in Atlanta has students take a picture, walk ten steps, take another picture, and so on until a roll of film has been used, teaching them to notice how the world is different only ten steps away" (p.34). Theories, like pictures, are a freeze frame of current data, and as the data changes, the researcher's theories should change too.

Glaser and Strauss (1967) note, "Grounded theory, it should be mentioned, may take different forms....Grounded theory can be presented either as a well-codified set of propositions or in a running theoretical discussion, using conceptual categories and their properties" (p. 31).

"Analysis involves 'fracturing' data into 'lump of meaning' (e.g., events, actions, acts, statements, concepts) and a subsequent restructuring, first by categorization and

then by developing relationships between categories" (Walker, 1985, p. 185).

One way qualitative researchers conduct analysis is by coding the data into categories. One way of accomplishing this quickly is for the researcher to select categories in advance and then simply place the appropriate sections of data into the proper categories they illustrate. However, while in principle this categorization is possible, in practice it is difficult for the researchers to do and still remain sensitive to any unanticipated categories. Thus, the researcher must try to develop a crucial base of the categories and concepts of the research participants to form a set of conceptual categories. However, in comparing, contrasting, and uniting categories, a broader group of "sensitizing concepts" will formulate to incorporate current data analysis (Jones, 1985, p. 59).

As Anderson (1987) states, "What the analyst is trying to observe are those critical instances when the underlying meanings of the action are revealed....Critical instances are recognizable after the fact because they stand out from the routine" (p. 327).

According to Jones (1985):

In doing this I am also inevitably making connections, as carefully and as explicitly as I can, with the concepts and theories I already have about the area of investigation, in ways which can confirm, elaborate, modify or reject them. I also make connections with what I understand to be the concerns and preconceptions of any research clients (p. 59).

When studying a single case of some social phenomenon, it is difficult to not implicitly make comparison of "internal distinctions" in collected data. It is also difficult not to suggest how realities of like and different relate to other "kind on the same plane" (Schatzman and Strauss, 1973, p. 126).

Glaser and Strauss (1967) have compared several methods of qualitative analysis, and there are generally four approaches to the analysis of data: 1) Ethnographic description, which typically aims to present the participants' concepts and categories without generating nor testing hypotheses; 2) Test prior hypotheses against data, which is when a researcher focuses on a problem for specific answers and concludes with supporting analysis. This approach does not generate theory, but does tests theory. 3) Analytic induction, which is concerned with generating and proving an integrated, limited, precise, universally applicable theory accounting for a certain behavior. This approach generates and tests theory; 4) Constant comparative method, which in contrast to analytic induction, is concerned with generating and suggesting many categories, properties, and hypotheses about general problems, conditions, consequences, dimensions, types, processes or causes. Although this approach can generate theory, it cannot test theory (Glaser and Strauss, 1967, Walker, 1985).

As Glaser and Strauss (1967) explain, "In theoretical sampling, the data collected are not extensive enough and,

because of theoretical saturation, are not coded extensively enough to yield provisional tests....They are coded only enough to generate, hence to suggest, theory" (p. 103).

According to Jones (1985):

Throughout the process of comparison and integration I continue to make yet further notes, my commentary on what I am doing and why. It is these notes, with the data they refer to which, finally, form the basis of any research report and/or debrief (p. 67).

As Manen (1990) describes, "Some qualitative studies consist of little more than endless reproductions and fragments of transcripts under the guise that the researcher has decided "to let the data speak for themselves" (p. 167).

Finally, as Walker (1985) explains:

...the qualitative researcher differs from say, a novelist, in that he has a greater obligation to be explicit about the basis for his interpretation of events and, as far as possible, to provide evidence that would facilitate re-examination. Such evidence may need to be included in the main body of the report when an important interpretation is difficult (p. 193).

Theme Analysis

Analysis involves spitting data into lumps of meaning and then developing relationships between categories; one way to report these relationships is through the use of themes.

Themes convey the shared patterns of collected interpreted data and explain the similarities or differences among the participants' viewpoints. Shared patterns of causes, problems, opinions, observations, and comments are

combined together to generate various themes. According to Mishler (1986):

From transcriptions it becomes clear that the meanings of questions and answers are not fixed by nor adequately represented by the interview schedule or by code-category systems. Instead, meanings emerge, develop, are shaped by and in turn shape the discourse (p. 138).

The discourse of this study will best be reflected using themes as opposed to metaphors, models, or analogs that rely on comparative measures for analysis. Comparative analysis requires a generalized understanding of the compared metaphor or model and forces the researcher to avoid misinterpretations by others when presenting his/her data analysis, whereas themes emerge as a result of a discovery process as data analysis identifies likenesses and differences in the data and are presented with clear, traceable interpretations to the transcribed interviews.

One of the most important capabilities of using themes is to allow the researcher to explain and report patterns of interpreted data that just "happen," "jump out," or are "unheard of" (Miles and Huberman, 1984, p. 216). One of the goals of this study is to discover possible new themes of how the corporate video department is coping with an identity crisis.

Finally, there are some pitfalls related to theme development and data analysis conclusions in general that should be avoided. The pitfalls include provincialism, hasty conclusions, questionable classifications, questionable

causes, suppressed evidence, and false dilemmas. These pitfalls can be avoided by introspection - or simply placing emphasis on the researcher's self examination of inner thoughts and feelings and how that affects the interpreted world around them (Babbie, 1983).

Summary

The in-depth or depth interview is a conversation where the researcher encourages informants to respond to a variety of questions. In a depth interview, the meaning of the subjects' viewpoint is the final goal. If the researcher uses depth interviews with a preconceived set of hypotheses, the participants' viewpoint will be lost and so will their interpretive meanings. Researchers must constantly monitor the interview for direction, depth, and detail. Certain sensitive questions and topics need to be addressed carefully.

The depth interview procedure must be defined before the interview in order to ensure "good data." An open and trusting relationship between researcher and participant is important for honest participant response. The researcher begins the interviewing process by reviewing the agenda of topics to be covered and the aims of the interview and research. The researcher must remember to ask for permission to tape-record the interview and allow for clarification of any details if the interviewee is confused or lost within the context of the interview. The researcher must also control

at the outset and use tactical measures for handling difficult interviews. The audio tape should be transcribed as soon as possible and the transcripts should be marked with any significant patterns or notable emphases.

The participants chosen for this research have been selected for their varied backgrounds and knowledge of corporate video.

Data analysis entails identifying themes that are contained in the collected data. Collected data must be examined closely so that nonpertinent material can be filtered out. The point of theory conceptualization begins with sorting coded data into categories and then constantly comparing categories to develop emerging themes.

Chapter 3

Data Analysis

This chapter will describe the data collection process, the analyzed data through the use of themes, and finally a data interpretation as a summary. The themes are a collection of similar patterns of the participant responses and are supported by excerpts from their transcribed depth interviews.

Data Collection Process

Each of the participants was asked for permission to record his/her interview and each granted it. Participants were told that their transcribed interview would be used as a means of data collection for this study and they would receive a copy of the study after completion of the thesis requirements. Prior to the recorded telephone call, each was sent a set of questions without the additional sidebar probes. The depth phone interviews averaged one hour in length and after transcription, produced an average of 40 pages of text. Each of the interviews took place while the participants were at their business offices.

Scott Carlberg was first to be interviewed on April 11, 1991 at 8:01 AM EST in Bartlesville, Oklahoma. Eugene Marlow was interviewed on April 16, 1991 at 4:38 PM EST in New York. Judith and Douglas Brush were interviewed on April 19, 1991 at 8:29 AM EST in LaGrangeville, New York. And finally, John

Rice was interviewed on April 19, 1991 at 4:04 PM EST in Yardly, Pennsylvania.

Emerging Themes

Once transcriptions were completed and verified for accuracy, a simple coding process was used to begin to identify interpreted meaning and understanding of the participants' responses. At this initial stage, each comment or response was assigned its own code using two or three descriptive words. Once this was completed, a computer was used for an electronic cut and paste of similar shared codes and was attached to the participants' excerpts. The first merge of shared codes produced over 30 themes.

Upon examination of these 30 themes, similar ones were grouped to form 18 resulting themes. Again, the tapes were reviewed with their respective transcripts and re-classified according to these newly combined themes. A second comparison of these 18 themes to the coded excerpts only produced substantial evidence to support the 13 themes reported in this study. Finally, for a fourth time, the excerpts were re-classified according to these 13 themes and are reported in this study.

Transcribed paragraphs were the basis on which re-classifications and coding took place, and with the data base attributes of search, list, and sort inherent in the word processor, re-classification was precise.

Themes

The following themes were compiled from the interview transcripts. An interpretation of these themes and their relationship to this study are also included under the appropriate theme.

Growth

Several factors have affected the growth of corporate video over the last 20 years. These include organizational communication needs, equipment costs, programming, and distribution.

When asked what was the largest growth factor in corporate video, Judith Brush responded, "Well, from my perspective, I feel that the single largest growth factor in corporate video has been the needs of the organization." J. Brush explains further:

The need to communicate to more people, such as all the government-related issues - EEO, ERISA, etc. The need to train. We certainly see articles every week in one of the business trades about the need to retrain America - either people on jobs currently or to bring people into a corporation who don't have basic skills -- including reading and writing -- and having to train them.

And when Douglas Brush was asked if he agreed with her viewpoint, he responded, "Yes, absolutely."

Whereas John Rice responded that the largest growth factor was price. He states:

I think getting professional gear into the hands of people who don't have major budgets to spend. I think a corporate video

department that knows they can get in for tens of thousands of dollars with U-matic or super VHS equipment is much more encouraging to get a business involved than, even as little as five years ago, required major broadcast-type investment.

Does this compare to the demand or need for programming?

Rice responds, "Yeah. I think the demand for programming becomes a function of the ability to deliver it at a reasonable cost."

Eugene Marlow responded with even another view as to the largest growth factor question. He states that it all has to do with distribution capability.

This is all basic economics. It all has to do with supply and demand. When you have a distribution capability out there and an audience hungry for communications, you create programming. It's not a hardware-driven industry really, it's if you have a distribution system out there in which you now have various levels of distribution, you have internal video networks, you have home video networks, you have trade shows, you have places where there is a video cassette player, and that presents an opportunity. And there is always a need to communicate information in one way or another, so if you have the distribution capability, you can then begin to supply it with programming.

Scott Carlberg states his reason for the growth and level of acceptance of corporate video in the last 20 years as the ease of use of both the consumer equipment in the home and the professional equipment in the workplace. As he states:

It used to be that when corporate video just started, you could have narration over color bars and people would stand there and watch it just because they couldn't believe that it was actually there that you did it in the studio. Of course, that's gone now because it's in the

home and I think it's just more accepted - a common everyday part of business.

As mentioned in the review of literature and in the data analysis, growth has been an outstanding factor to the success of the corporate video department. Growth in department size, functions, program distribution, equipment capabilities, and corporate communication needs has had many positive and few negative effects on the corporate video department. However, the lack of growth within any one of these areas has resulted in an unrecoverable catastrophic effect for the very existence of many corporate video departments.

Limiting Growth

There also have been several factors limiting the growth of corporate video over the last 20 years, such as failure of one's first project or production, lack of professionally trained talent that is normally found in broadcast television, or simply budgetary cutbacks.

As before, the respondents varied in their views yet explicitly implied that there could have been additional growth within corporate video. When asked what he thought was the single largest detriment to the growth of corporate video, D. Brush responded quite simply, "Money. Cutbacks in budget."

Marlow believes that the largest detriment to the growth of corporate video is the fact that it is not a mass

communication medium. And when asked if that meant the use of some type of delivery system, he replied, "No no. It has to do with the professionalism of the people in the business." As Marlow explains further:

The problem -- it's an inherent problem -- is that to do an hour's worth of prime time programming on broadcast television where you can deliver an audience of millions of people, a company will spend 800,000 up to 1.2, 1.3 million dollars for that one hour. Well, let's say we're now at a half-an-hour corporate training program, no corporation in their right mind anyway is going to spend, on a regular basis, half a million dollars on producing that program. Maybe they will spend 50,000-60,000 dollars on that program. Maybe. When you deal with dollars on a much smaller order of magnitude, you are not going to attract the kind of talent to it and level of professionalism that a million-dollar program is going to attract.

Carlberg agrees:

I think with the TV people themselves -- the producer, directors and managers -- that you've got a lot of TV people and not a lot of business people. TV people don't always understand business. They can't understand why they can't have funding for more equipment and they don't realize this company is not in the TV business.

Carlberg continued describing TV as merely a tool to help reach the goals of that business and that the business does not exist to support TV. He stated, "And I think that some people get a little high-minded about their existence, but they won't be for long because they won't be there."

Carlberg explains the reality of the corporate environment:

Somebody could take this 700,000 dollar operating budget and show a better return than

us. And then they deserve it. And we all ought be out the door. A hard job is to take that money and make it do some good for the company. You work for the shareholder and you've just got to understand that. Some people are a bit closeminded and they need a better customer service attitude.

And Rice thought that the largest detriment to the growth of the corporate video department is failure. As Rice explains:

The company that makes a test and does one tape and it doesn't work, Or the company [or] the administration that believes that there will be a direct financial payoff and it's not -- I would guess that more companies have not done video after doing one poorly.

As he also notes:

And if your first failure is your first time out of the box -- forget it! Especially if someone has gone in there and has been real proactive as a staff member. We need a video department. We have got to do this. It's the competitive edge this company needs. It's the future. It's the growth. And they do one and for whatever reason, it bombs. It just doesn't work. It goes way over budget. It offends somebody in management. Failure is the biggest thing.

Stages

As the corporate video industry continues to develop, there is an uncertainty as to where in the development cycle the corporate video industry currently stands, or even if a cycle exists.

The participants were asked to describe what they believe to have been the different stages of development for

the corporate video industry as it is today and to predict future development stages.

This question was asked in order to determine the current stage of development of the entire video industry and investigate the existence of recurring patterns or cycles of development.

Rice answered the question, "It's in adolescence. It's beyond infancy. It's having its growing pains." He explained further:

Well, there was this burst in the mid 1980s. Everybody had to have a video department. And think of it as a kid who suddenly goes through this growth spurt-- the hormones start raging mad; he can tackle the world; he's getting bigger and stronger and lanky and awkward; I think we have been through that. Now we're just at the end of that. It's starting to get a little bit more mature, but it's still a relatively young business. There are new people coming in all the time, so I don't think it's a mature, stable industry by any stretch of the imagination. But it's also not infantile. You know, so there are people who have a lot of experience.

D. Brush describes the several stages or periods of development for the corporate video industry:

From the technology standpoint, you can divide it into periods of time. In the earliest forms of corporate television where either live video conferencing connected with telephone lines or totally one-location applications where a video program was videotaped in the training department and shown only in that department on that same machine because it couldn't be shown on another machine -- there was no networking per se. If they had to distribute a program to more than one location, they did a live video conference via satellite, so they went over the AT&T lines.

D. Brush adds that until the video cassette, companies may have had an in-house facility because there were no outside production facilities other than broadcast houses to use for their video production. As a result, distribution was very centralized because there were no inexpensive means of program distribution. As he states:

The video cassette set in motion the growth of the video networks, and not too much of the production end changed at that time. In other words, companies got into corporate television by establishing distribution networks rather than production facilities. Prior to that, to get into it, you had to establish production facilities. Now you would establish a network and eventually work into production facilities after you were producing more and more programs to feed the networks. Because the original cost of production facilities were so high, equipment was bulky, expensive, you needed a whole host of highly trained technicians. The technology was evolving with the ENG, electronic field production equipment, which became more portable, shoulder models, and we basically went back to what we call the portapak days.

D. Brush explained how production styles and video quality changed with the development of portable equipment in the 1970s. As he states:

Production styles changed radically because we went from big studio cameras to lesser quality studio cameras. And production quality actually fell off, because we were using intermediate industrial grade equipment, until finally we were able to use the broadcast equipment, which was lower in price, higher in quality, and easier to use. We now have the betacam standard that most companies are shooting on or they're shooting a high quality 3/4 [U-matic]. They're practically all using CCD cameras. So we've gone from the centralized studio to the distribution network to now portable and distributive production.

J. Brush agrees and comments, "That's pretty much the track that it's gone through. And that kind of reflects our Brush Reports over the last 20 years."

Yet Marlow divides the stages differently, into technology and then according to program purpose. He stated:

It breaks down into the early stages of 1959 to 1971 when essentially you had some people who bought quad, then there was the black-and-white, reel to reel technology was introduced in the mid 1960s and a lot of role playing in training was going on. And then 1971, 1972, the corporate networks were born. Then in 1980, there seems to be a sharp break when companies started to go outside, more external stuff, videotaped annual reports, which made a big deal in 1980.

Marlow then emphasizes the various programming stages:

The 1960s was really primarily training. [In] the 1970s, communications on a broader scale came into the act. Top executives going into the business started to become stars of their own videos. 1980s was a lot of reaching out. And the 1990s is probably going to be an extension of the same -- video communications on a global scale.

Marlow added that in 1980 a variety of technologies matured or reached critical mass.

There was a sort of a critical mass reached with cable television, critical mass reached with satellite teleconferencing, there was a critical mass reached with in terms of broadcast television and the cable television coming more into its own; it was like that year, sort of, there was something that happened in that year and a variety of ways with respect to communication.

What do you think triggered this? Marlow responded, "With any technology, what you see initially is a handful of people control the technology in the beginning and then it

gets smaller [in physical size]. It becomes standardized, becomes more accessible, and more and more people get their hands on it. And that's what you have today." As Marlow continues, "There's always an antecedent. There's always some technology that came before. There's always something that was done before that didn't work -- that had to wait several years for something else to come along so that it would work."

Yet Carlberg answers the question of identifying the various development stages as, "You take it as a whole. I think it's quite well developed. Within that whole, there are people that are at various stages." And identifying those exact stages, he replies, "I don't have any labels for them." But he adds this point, "You know, you've got to crawl before you walk and I think a company that does it well, does it in stages."

Parallels

The characteristic growth patterns of the corporate video department have also been found in the MIS (Management Information Systems) department, without any physical or managerial ties between them.

Rice answers the question of identifying any similarities of growth of any other corporate department that equals that of the corporate video department, by stating:

This may be wishful thinking, but it seems to have worked in the ones who are successful -- the video department that parallels the growth of an MIS department, that centrally located experts who feed into every single department.... In an MIS department, it's mostly a service department that helps to encourage the expansion of computers. I think a lot of corporate communications, corporate video departments, are paralleling that track.

D. Brush agrees and responds with:

The distribution of data processing throughout the organization has been followed by the distribution of media production -- multi-media ranging from print to video. And yes, we see that very definitely the corporate video has been on parallel tracks with what's happening in the data systems area. Those data managers who have not recognized the need for distributed processing or user-driven PC technologies have been in difficult straights. The same thing for a video manager who does not recognize that his former customer can now produce a videotape on his own without him is also in dire straights so they have to shift their roles and have a different identity within the organization as a result of this.

When asked to explain the possible reasons for similarity, D. Brush states:

That there has to be a close working relationship between the video people and the data systems people because those technologies are merging so rapidly. They have to know and understand each other. That understanding has to be driven by the corporate communications or video people. Because they've got a foot in both worlds, they can educate the data systems people in communications, if they do it right. Human resources is increasingly being driven by the letter of the law rather than actual human need and the management is again looking at the HR people as another cost center. How much do we really need them?

And when the same question of similarities between growth patterns is addressed to Marlow, he answers with a familiar, "The one that immediately beeps to mind is the

computer department or telecommunications. They all sort of come out of the same technological root."

Hard Times

With the current rash of cutbacks, layoffs, and a slow economy, recession has hit the corporate video department. As a result the departments are very "lean and mean."

D. Brush began his interview by responding to the question of how corporate video is changing.

All corporations are facing cutbacks, downsizing, and so forth, so when you have the financial people looking around at each of the operations, with a very critical eye as to the need for that operation, many of them come to the conclusion that when you are getting into an area like audiovisual support and video, is this something we really need to have in-house? We may need these services, and we may need more of these services than the in-house facility can even provide, but do we want to keep this in-house because of the capital requirements in keeping a facility here or the need to have people on the payroll?"

He continues:

Because corporate culture within an organization rarely ever changes -- it's what they do about it that changes -- there's been a shift in corporate attitudes toward in-house services over the last 10 years. In the mid 1970s, the attitude of most large organizations was they wanted to have everything in-house so they could control it and not outsource anything. No matter how specialized or specific the service might be. The attitude was well we know our company better and we want to control this and we want to have this capability in-house, and quite frankly it was middle management empire building in 99 percent of the cases. It wasn't really necessary to do that but they

wanted to show off and say 'look what we can do and we can do this cheaper' and of course they bury their cost. The attitude today is, we don't want to have this stuff in-house. We are not in that kind of business and we'll hire that outside service on the job.

J. Brush states some examples as she continues D. Brush's views.

This week is NAB [1991] in Las Vegas. Now, the price tags on that equipment are very high.... Now in a corporation, is it wise to spend your money on technology like this? No. You're not in the video business.

As J. Brush also notes concerns for staffing the in-house video department:

You have to career path people through the organization. How are you going to career path a videographer through the corporation? Plus the fact that if you're hiring somebody for something we're doing now or you're hiring a guy for \$60-70,000 and the benefits etc., are another 30 or 40 percent, then you add on the overhead, the parking space and the allotments for the company cafeteria. Do you really need that person, when you may only need that person three, four times a year? Would it be better to have somebody who is a really super duper script writer or specialized talent executive producer hire somebody outside on a project basis? You may end up paying a little bit more as far as salary [and] in fees over the year, but at least you're not carrying that corporate overhead.

D. Brush points out that "You've got a number of factors at work here, all of which are converging, causing these trends. One of which is the economy itself, which is forcing companies to reassess what they need in the way of staff services." J. Brush provides an example:

Certainly in the last week I've found, in doing an executive search for a client, that a

number of the long-time full-time video users, video departments have changed rather radically. One pharmaceutical company dissolved their department, putting each of the functions within it, which were quality graphics to video, in three separate operating units.

D. Brush adds:

That's right on target. The fact is that most of the in-house facilities are now being on what we call a zero charge back basis or a full charge back basis rather and a zero budget. They have to recover all of their costs including their overhead and salaries so the iron is definitely affecting their own in-house entrepreneurial activity. In certain instances, we've seen cases in the last couple of years where a full-fledged in-house department was sold to an outside company -- personnel and everybody with it -- and then the company would turn around and hire the services of their former employee."

Carlberg indicates that changes are needed soon, "When you see people walking out with a lot of boxes in their hands with their personal belongings, you can tell that there is a very drastic change coming about and you've got to ask how it's changing your business. That was my audience walking out the door."

Rice describes current changes in corporate video and reinforces the views of the other participants when he states:

I've been hearing about a lot of people who have been laid off and cut back in the corporations just through the general recession, so the departments themselves are in a little bit of trouble in that they're falling to the whims of the economy. However, I do think there are probably -- I can't quantify this -- but many more departments than there were say 2, 3, 4, 5 years ago. And a lot more companies are seeing and investigating video. So, overall it seems to

be growing, but what's happening internally with each department is they seem to be scaling down to a great degree - Keeping enough people to manage it, but really depending a lot on outside services.

Marlow, when responding earlier to the different stages of development, sheds a little light here in our current gloom when he points out:

It seems that the corporate video department has gone through cycles. At one point everybody was going outside for sources and then everybody went inside, you know, with their own video production department and then a few years ago people started shutting down video departments and going outside again.

And J. Brush agrees:

I think we are going to come out the other end of this whole cycle because it's not only affecting corporate video departments, it's also affecting data processing, legal and other separate services departments. I think we're going to come out working smarter at the end of the cycle; that we are going to not staff up for the sake of staffing up.

J. Brush continues:

Now we're into total quality commitment, because of the Malcolm Baldrige Award. Every company is competing for that. Where we're self analyzing, we're doing benchmark studies. I mean there's even talk of doing a benchmark study for the audiovisual industry. People are really concerned about, you know, are they using their money wisely?

Changing Functions

The role of the corporate video department is taking on more of a general communications function, no longer limiting it to just a video provider.

Rice explains how he views the changes in the corporate video department:

I know a lot of the early departments grew out of other internal services departments -- the AV department became the video department; the guys who used to make slides and do publications became a separate video department; or video fell within their area. And I see a fair number of video departments now taking over a general communications role.

J. Brush again shows us a clear example of how the video department is changing to more of a general communications role. She begins by describing a specific training program that uses multi-media:

... why go to the expense and the bother to go to a central corporate source when the program is never going to be used beyond the confines of your plant in Raleigh, North Carolina? The content experts are there, and the training people are becoming more sophisticated in dealing with media and why not produce it there? Leaving, of course, the person with the rolodex at corporate headquarters to do more corporate slide programming, to be targeting in on the real needs within the whole strategic planning area of, you know, is there a multi-product rollout from a division that's going to impact the bottom line.... So the corporate person would deal with that cosmic issue, or getting video conferencing rooms set up across the corporation, or dealing in an international business television conference to deal with new research and development across the world, or reaching clients around the world. So there's this corporate video person who should be dealing with strategic and cosmic issues rather than worrying about a fork lift truck operating an operator training program in Raleigh, North Carolina.

D. Brush agrees and describes the changes in personnel within the department, as he states:

The in-house coordinator becomes much more of a consultant in his role and advises the users in their own use of these users in technology. So the person, the last guy there with the rolodex has to be an expert in all things and be able to help the people do their own things within the organization.

Carlberg notices different changes in personnel as he states:

I think the fact that more professional people are oriented toward corporate video has been a big improvement. When I started in corporate video that was usually the second choice. Everybody wanted to go into a broadcast station and do the news. You know, live that kind of exciting life as they thought it was. And I see people now that are being groomed more toward corporate. The academic side is coming in and training people for corporate work.

And do you feel this to be a result of their education? Carlberg responds, "Oh yeah, more focused on business as opposed to just TV for broadcast."

When asked about merging functions of the corporate video department with other corporate departments, Rice responded:

An AV department and video -- yeah; a publications department and video -- yeah. Any other communications services department, can easily be merged with video into a larger communications role. The other side of that, which I haven't seen at all is a viability if video could become the day-to-day tool that I hear a lot of the manufacturers talking about. It is being divisionalized and sales has its own video department; PR has its own video department; perhaps each one of these staffs has a video specialist on board who may go back and use a main corporate video facility, but there are specialists in each department who know how to put you in the right package for that department's own needs.

However, Carlberg demonstrates how important it is to be broad in scope about one's services. When asked about the importance of scope to the success of the corporate video department, he states:

Well, if we are a communications problem solver in successful companies, it is. You can't just turn out glitz with no reason for it because it will come back and eat your lunch later and you just can't do it, because you can see through that. It's like spending a lot of money to produce a program just to get an award. The award's nice. Put it on your shelf. Let it gather dust. But if you're not working in the meantime, hey, what's it matter?

And Rice, in answering a question about what should the functions of the corporate video department be, responds:

I think a smart video department is going to consider alternative media. They're going to be involved in slides. They may be involved in print; they are going to be involved in some degree of computer -- be it desktop publishing or graphics, interactive disk-based stuff -- so I think it's ultimately communication -- internal and external -- is the way a department should cast itself. We are here as a communications tool for whatever the needs may be.

Marlow seems to agree and states that in his book, back in 1978, he wrote:

... the ideal department is not a corporate video department but a corporate media department that had under its roof, television, graphics, photography, print, as in duplication stuff like that; It could even combine telecommunications all in one large department working together in a coordinated way -- but that's an ideal.

Carlberg provides an example:

In 1975 through 1983, training was very important here at Phillips Petroleum because

we were adding people, oil prices were high, we were doing a lot of different things, and we had to get training out. When we cut from 37,000 to 21,000 employees, who are we going to train? So the question came up, why do we need video? And we had changed our focus. It's just that some people didn't realize that and that was my mistake in not communicating with them. We went from training to a lot of product promotion.

As he continues:

So we changed the emphasis of what we were producing. And we wouldn't ever let it stay with just one thing. It was a variety of things that we would cover, not just training ever, not just product promotion, not just management communications but a blend.

Worth

As a nonrevenue-generating department, the corporate video department must prove its value to the corporation as a whole.

In listing the needed characteristics of a successful corporate video department, Rice states:

One of the big problems with the corporate video department within any industry is it's not a revenue generating division. And video spends a lot of money often compared to other service divisions within the company. And one of the things you are seeing right now is companies are looking at their video departments and saying "well we're spending a lot of money but what's our real return? How can we calculate our return?" So the successful department is one that has proven to their upper management that there is a value -- if not a cash value -- that there is good reason to have this department around.

D. Brush adds to the theme and gives us this viewpoint:

What's happening in American business and industry is that top management is looking at all staff support functions with a very critical eye. Because they are not profit centers, they are not cost centers, and they're looking at it from a standpoint of not what their actual value to the organization is, but whether these same services can be acquired through outside sources with less capital investment, commitment to people and operating expenses -- Offsetting the need for having these services in house, with executive convenience, confidentiality, or cost.

Marlow points out how this value to the corporation is already present in other corporate video departments:

I mean, if in some companies video is looked on as an inherent part of how they do business -- look at J.C. Penney with its incredible satellite, its business television capability -- that on a daily basis, they are using television to help sell a product. Merrill Lynch with its business television network. They've got a long tradition of being in the video communications business. And there are a lot of other companies you can cite. But then there are other companies where there is not a long tradition or where management doesn't see the value or it's a whole variety of things. Video communications is becoming more and more a staple, but it has taken almost 20 years for that to evolve. But in some corporations, it's not a commodity like the telephone -- yet. It may take another 5 or 10 years.

The relationship between the ever-increasing corporate communication needs and a successful corporate video department becomes clearer when one views the video department as a total communication solution resource rather than merely an in-house service outlet. When corporate management views the video department as a service center similar to a paper duplication or copy center, which provides a standard service, then that video department is surely

struggling for survival and exists only if it can prove that it is cost effective. To be a successful corporate video department today, corporate management must identify the video department as a total communication solution resource similar to the way in which the Human Resource department (HR) is viewed for employee benefits and career development solutions or the Management Information Systems (MIS) department is tasked with providing corporate-wide data and computer solutions. The idea of proving the cost-effectiveness of HR or MIS departments and expecting a standard service bureau environment to be adopted by either department is unheard of within corporate management offices. There are several departments that must work together to provide this ideal corporate-wide communication solution.

Traits

While unique within their respective organizations, successful video departments share similar traits, too. Some commons traits are not advocating video as the ultimate solution, understanding the objectives of the corporation, and understanding the importance of being cost effective. But a common trait inherent in all successful corporate video departments is that no matter what the communications task or project, "never say no." The department should market itself as an internal and external communications tool, and as a solution service or advisor to public relations, marketing,

corporate communications and other divisions searching for answers to their communication problems.

Each of the participants was asked to describe the traits and functions of a successful corporate video department. J. Brush responded:

What makes the departments that are successful successful are 1) understanding the bottom-line orientation of the corporation as a whole 2) really having a good rate card for full charge back to their various in-house clients, sometimes saving an in-house client as much as 35 percent over going outside and 3) understanding what the strategic needs of the company are and being involved as much as possible in that planning. Are they going to open new satellite offices around the country? What can we do to make communications training and marketing activities more effective in those areas? We've had a situation where we have to put in video conferencing rooms. You know, what's the ultimate need of the corporation, not today but maybe five years hence? So successful departments are doing that and doing it very well.

Carlberg also had a similar view as he states:

I think that a strong video department will understand true corporate goals and true management goals and philosophies and will work with them. Another strength is that I think the ones that have survived have not been narrow in scope. They have touched a variety of levels within the people that they work with and within the departments that are within a company. I think a successful group also keeps score of their work. They work by the numbers. They don't just do a program and say "well that was nice" and it goes out the door and that's it. They test to see what kind of results they got, what kind of cost savings, what difference that they made, and then they advertise what happened so that they can't be misunderstood in the eyes of management. And I also think a successful

group has a good sales and customer service attitude.

"Never say no," is better explained by Rice as he states:

Saying maybe, or throw out the caveat of, you know, well we could do this but it would be terribly expensive, let us see if we can come up with some alternatives for you. The best way a corporate video department works is to position themselves as a solutions service. If someone from another division of the company, be it manufacturing or PR or whatever, walks in and says, "I want to do a 10-minute video on a, b, c, d and e," then that's what they are going to do. If someone walks in and says, "I am trying to figure out how to get across to our sales people this point," then suddenly the video department becomes an advisor and they can say, "well maybe we should do a videotape, which shows this new manufacturing process, explains to the sales people why we are reducing the price of this product. Maybe we should do a videotape, which demonstrates this new line and the sales people can take it to their customers." When they can provide solutions instead of a service, then the department becomes much more valuable.

As Rice sums up his answer, "So how do they function? They function best as an advisor to other divisions of the company, not just a call-'em-up-and-place-an-order service."

Marlow explains why survival depends on understanding corporate direction, as he states:

The demands on the department are different now. It's not just training that it used to be in the 1960s, although training still is the leading application. It's now marketing, public relations, community relations, government relations, it's trade shows, you name it -- internal and external communications. The video departments that survive are the ones that have the most professional management and the broadest view of the corporation or the organization.

Rice responded that it is more than how the department views the company, but how the company views the corporate video department, as he explains:

I think the successful ones are the ones that can continually prove to their upper management that they have a value. The ones that succeed spend a lot of their time maintaining good relations with other management in other departments. It also seems that a lot of the successful departments, while they are advocates of video, are careful advocates -- you know, individuals who go in and seem to promise that everything should be answered by video tend to wear out their welcome pretty fast. But there are a lot of people who walk into meetings and the minutes of the meeting say you don't need video for this assignment. So the ones who really fit in, in that respect, seem to be the ones who are successful.

According to Carlberg, marketing is the key to success.

You can't rely on some programs coming in my opinion. You can't just hang out the shingle and wait for people to walk in the door. You do get a certain amount of programs like that, but you have to evaluate each one. If you just take everything that came in the door and assume that those are the right things to do, you are assuming first of all that all these people know exactly why the studio should be there and the direction in which it's heading in the organization, and you are also giving up your right to direct the place as manager. And that's not why you're being paid. You're being paid to direct the work of the studio. So direct it. You don't just take them as they come in. You go out and sell and you look at the direction of the studio and you say "where do we need to be a year or two from now? Let's go find those clients." And you go to those staff meetings, and those managers, and those vice presidents, and you make your sales pitch and say "here's what I can do for you and here's how I'll do it and here's what we'll both get out of it."

He continues on how departments should market themselves:

Well, you sit down with your boss and your producers. What are you guys hearing? You know, how is this affecting things? What are people telling you? You get out to staff meetings -- it sounds horrible, it's kind of like torture to say I want to go attend some staff meetings, but you can learn an awful lot about the organization by going to some diverse staff meetings and seeing what they are doing. Take a look at your annual report -- see where the contributions are coming from in the company.

As Carlberg notes:

There is not a lot of fun sitting in meetings and talking about objectives or trying to sell obstinate clients or sitting in people's staff meetings to try to hear what their needs are or going to trade shows on subjects that you just have no interest in to see how things are being used or doing feedback afterwards. That's just not an exciting thing, but it's essential to really focus the activities of any video group if it's going to be successful. You can't do just the fun stuff.

And who influenced Carlberg with his marketing and service attitude? He replied:

I got mine in two areas. My graduate advisor really pounded that into me; he was way ahead of the curve on corporate TV. He was pushing it back in the early seventies. And my first supervisor did an amazing amount of work on the corporate attitude. You would never ever hear him say "no we can't do that goodbye." He would say "You don't really want tape. You really want x." His common phrase was, "how can I help you?" And he meant it. I don't see that in a lot of places. Video people will berate clients that come in wanting something that is genuinely a silly idea but at least it was an idea. There are so many people in this world who don't have any ideas, it's a shame to malign somebody who does, even though you may not think it's on target. And sometimes I've gone back and you know the idea

has been amazingly on target -- it's just that they haven't defined them real well.

Carlberg adds:

And something else I learned is that the person that you may alienate today as a client may be in an incredibly different position later on that can affect you. And take care of them because you never know where you are going to run up against them again.

Marlow examined how this leadership of the department manager is key to a successful department. As Marlow states:

It's one where the manager of the department understands the objectives of the corporation, understands the objectives of individual departments, understands the needs of the specific executives in the various aspects of the organization, who understands television production, who understands management of people, who understands about storytelling, who understands about being cost effective -- all of the above. It's not just any one thing.

And J. Brush agrees, as she describes a good leader:

A good leader doesn't have to be a hands-on technologist, but someone who is constantly searching for new ways of helping their in-house clients. There are folks we have worked with who do that very well, who are always on top of the strategic needs of the corporation and who are always looking towards new technologies or new programming format styles.

Marlow adds:

If you are talking about the person who is running the corporate video business, they had better be a communications generalist; that is, they need to understand the communications problem solving process, but they also need to understand things like organizational structure and behavior. They need to understand politics in the corporate sense. They need to understand things like basic business, accounting, profit loss. They need to understand about business strategy not only for their own department but for the organization as a whole.

As an example of what corporations are looking for as a leader of the corporate video or corporate communications department, J. Brush states:

It's amazing, going back to the current issue and looking at resumes from some 50 people -- top people -- in the industry and they're supposed to be, you know, like the AV director or video manager or director of communication services, how few of them address the bottom line! And yet our clients are telling us they want bottom-line-oriented managers. Everyone is so excited about being a producer director creative type that they forget that they have a business to conduct. I just got a resume from somebody who over the phone sounds terrific, his resume looks good, and his cover letter tells me that all he wants to do is supervising creative people and to do creative work; that's not what my client wants. My client wants a manager who is aware of the strategic needs of the corporation, current and future technology, and above all is bottom-line oriented.

Marlow concludes:

Well, you have to be in the right place, too. I mean you can be all of these things, have all these characteristics and be in an organization that doesn't appreciate them. So very often it has to do with a good fit between the manager of the video operation and his or her boss. It has to do with the point of view that the very top of the organization has with respect to video communications in general or communications in general, never mind video communications. If the top management wants to communicate, they will and they'll find every which way to do it effectively -- of which video is one tool.

And when asked if she had any percentages or statistics on the current success rate for corporate video departments, J. Brush stated:

We'll know more about that when we get the Fifth Brush Report done. But from going to various industry meetings and talking with

people on the phone and doing this executive search and talking to various other people who deal with corporate types around the country in the last two months, there are not that many successful video departments. Some of them are just plugging along and they may be satisfying a current need but whether or not they're going to be there [later], who knows?

Most successful video departments are ones that operate as separate businesses. If the video department treated company employees as clients and marketed themselves as if they were there to serve the video and communications needs of the corporation, then perhaps the company would recognize the true value of an in-house video department. A successful video department demonstrates that no one knows the corporate objectives and the most cost-effective solution better than the in-house video department and its networked resources -- not some video producer or production company found in the yellow pages.

Successful video departments that operate as a business must learn to "never say no" and to advise their in-house client on the best media solution that meets the client's budget and satisfies the goals of the corporation. If that means designing video conference rooms or complete conference centers, then the corporate video department is providing a total communication solution to the needs of that client. As a result, this sometimes means hiring outside consultants, designers, and even coordinating an outside building contractor through the corporate facilities department if necessary. This networking of outside services is essential

to keeping staff costs down yet providing endless capabilities to the video department.

The needs and expectations of corporate in-house clients are much different today than just 15 years ago. Successful corporate managers have always felt a "whatever it takes" attitude towards accomplishing their tasks and that has given them the freedom to go out-of-house for their needs. Successful video department managers have been able to keep business from going out-of-house by addressing the bottom line with a superior product. Today that product is more than just a training videotape - it is a multimedia communications package. The same successful video manager recognizes video as a medium and not a tool. The process by which the manager develops and molds a message or idea is his/her resource and not his/her function. Hence, today's video manager must be able to use his/her resource with alternate media such as interactive video, multimedia computer graphics, 35-mm slide presentations, and trade show booth exhibits. The various technologies should always be an asset, not a loss of business for the department. And the reason is simple: if the corporate video department can provide the in-house client with a solution that best meets his/her needs, whether it is slide or video, then the video department will have a satisfied client and that client will return. But if all a corporate video department can offer is video, then the resources available to the in-house corporate

client are extremely limited and the assumption is that the client knows exactly what he/she wants and needs - video.

Organizational Chart

Placement of the corporate video department within the corporate organizational chart is not as important as who can take advantage of this in-house capability. However, there are a few least favorable divisions, such as sales and marketing or facilities, with which to affiliate the corporate video department.

A part of the interview was designed to study the importance of the corporate video department's placement within the corporate structure and how it affects the video department's chances for survival. The participants were asked if a new corporate video department was created by a company, under what umbrella should that department be placed and why?

Rice responds, "The ones I've seen are usually under some corporate communications umbrella." But he also adds:

A lot depends on why does the company have a video department? What do they need? If it's primarily for internal communications, if you're a multi-national company and video serves you best to communicate with your employees, then maybe it belongs in the personnel department or human resources department. If you are a company that can take advantage of it from sales and marketing, maybe it belongs under the advertising department or the sales department.

J. Brush agrees:

We always say corporate communications. In most cases, you're under that umbrella of corporate communications, marketing, etc. However, there's a caveat -- it depends on the corporation. If it is needed in personnel, training, or marketing, then so be it. But there are exceptions. And although the trend has been to move it into corporate communications, there are real good reasons in some companies not to have it there. So you have to understand the culture of the organization and again their needs before determining where it in the world you are going to put corporate video.

Marlow responds with a similar view:

It should be placed in the department to allow the broadest access to the organization and vice versa. In other words, the marketing department may be the appropriate place because people from marketing will come there, people from sales promotion, from public affairs, from training, management development -- whatever the best place for the operation may be in the training department because everybody will come there. In other words, video is a trans application communications tool. It's not just training, it's not just public affairs or corporate communications, or marketing -- it can serve a variety of internal and external communications applications.

Rice also responds with a list of criteria:

I would think that you have to have three things to look for within that department. One that is a service group, you know, now that can be in a line, you know, an operating organization, but it has to be one that provides service to the corporation as a whole. One that has accessibility. One of the things in the job that I have done in management communication that's made it so nice is that my boss doesn't second guess things. When we want to do something with the president of the company or an executive vice president, we call him and we do it. And you don't have to go through a variety of committees or people to get there, because in

these days speed is of the essence to get things done.

Rice sums up with:

Service, accessibility and authority, I think, are the three conditions that you really have to meet when you look to put a video studio somewhere. So it can be in a variety of departments -- it can be in corporate affairs or human resources or training or planning and budgeting.

All participants were also asked to identify a department or departments that they would not place the corporate video department under and their reasons why.

Rice responds, "Least favorable? Anything financial. You know seriously, I mean the sales and marketing [department]." As he continues to explain:

Well, if they are going to need to document how they generated new sales, it's real tough to do with video. If it's personnel-oriented, then it gets to be difficult. If it's the more nonspecific they could be placed within a company, the less accountable they can be to profit and loss statements.

D. Brush felt strongly about not locating the corporate video department in the personnel department, as he said:

I would keep it totally away from anybody in human resources-at all cost. And the second place to keep it away from is the management information systems or the data systems people or telecommunications people. Both groups have a total absence of understanding for communications as we know it. The systems people are totally technology driven and don't understand applications whatsoever nor are they interested in applications and they hate end users with a passion. The human resource people are fearful of communications and they're driven by this one guiding principle: "If you tell them too much, it'll only raise more questions, so don't tell them anything."

And Marlow states that the worst placement for a newly created corporate video department would be under buildings and facilities. Marlow states why:

Because video communications is not just hardware. It's not just the equipment that makes it work, it's the software side of it. It's the creating of scripts, it's the understanding of audience needs and objectives and all that kind of stuff, it's writing good scripts. The hardware at this point is really transparent. It's how to use the technology.

If the video department is placed within the corporate communication department, as are the majority of video departments, then their ability to reach and be reached by the rest of the corporation is often limited. For example, unless a corporate employee is contributing to one of the periodicals/video magazines/communication workshops produced by a corporate communication department, he/she may never have the need nor desire to familiarize him/herself with the corporate communication department and its other capabilities (i.e., video department). Whereas, for the frequently visited departments, such as the HR or MIS departments, employees are constantly discovering any new or improved services that these departments can offer. Therefore, is it any wonder why the current ideal location for a video department is within the HR or MIS departments? Not only are these departments ideal locations, but often they are the corporate video department's largest clients.

Personnel

The qualities of a well-prepared corporate video professional are a strong business sense and training in the uses of various video production equipment. Even with all of the proper training, it is not just courses, it is really tenacity, experience, and character. An RTF [Radio, Television and Film] degree is not the first step toward a corporate video career, unless one simply desires a technical position. As a result, corporate video personnel should have a strong business sense, not just a strong video production background.

Generally, the participants responded that corporate video professionals are not currently trained to cope with major corporate changes or business politics. However, the participants stated that the professionals who were on top of current corporate events and who observed changes coped much better with the changes and could survive.

Each participant was asked if he/she felt that corporate video employees and new hires were sufficiently trained to cope with the current corporate environment as well as how they would go about training that workforce.

As Carlberg responded, "I think that they are adequately trained to cope with the current corporate TV environment, but they are not adequately trained to cope with the corporate business environment."

Marlow explains the business of television:

See, I don't know a lot of people that were trained for the corporate television business. And frankly I think the best people that are in the business were never trained for the corporate television business. I've been in the business for twenty years and I've never taken a television production course. And I've produced in all media about 500 different presentations in television, radio, but I've never taken a television production course. I teach it now. But I've never had taken a course, and I am just thinking of the people that in the business some of them came out of broadcast television, some of them came out of graphic arts, some of them came out of computer backgrounds, some of them came out of management backgrounds, or finance, they just had a bent for it. Corporate television is not just television, it's like show business. It's the business of putting on shows. It's as much as being in a business as it is knowing how to point the camera or write a script or edit or do all that kind of stuff. You have hundreds of people around that you can hire to direct, produce, write, be in front of the camera, run the camera, edit, put on makeup, build sets, whatever, but the real tough part is the business side.

Rice attributes the inability to cope with corporate change this way, "I don't think a lot of them understand that they're first and foremost corporate employees. They easily cast themselves as people on the outside." As he continues, "We're the outsiders, 'untouchables' and 'untouchers,' neither are they reached out to nor do they reach in."

Marlow suggests college as the source for the needed additional training in corporate business as he states:

Well there are colleges that offer courses in corporate video, but they're not too many people who have a really good overview of the business, which is the nature of the business, because everybody is looking at their own shop. It's like everybody's in their own

department and nobody is looking at the building, let alone the plot of land that everybody's on.

As Carlberg responds, "It's never too late to learn it on the job. You better or you'll find yourself in a terrible dilemma. I wish more colleges would prepare people, and I do see some doing that."

Currently, corporate video career minded college students are advised to take business oriented courses. As J. Brush explains:

In dealing with our students, the three things that they have to have in order to take our corporate video class are organizational communications, journalism, [and] student production. Then when they ask, "what else should we take as electives?" we suggest in addition to the communications-oriented public relations, etc., that they take introduction to psychology, introduction to political science, sociology, art, etc. Fill up your electives with a broad range of other areas so that you can understand the politics of an organization and group dynamics.

D. Brush comments:

That's half of it. Once you get that under your belt, then you have to be aware of everything going on in the technology field and understand it from the broad scale, not the details. You don't really need to know how a VCR operates, but you better know what certain key functions of the VCR are, what the heads are, what they do, why they clog sometimes and why they don't.

Rice agrees and responds with the following example:

If someone's a VP or someone is the executive producer or the on-line producer, chances are there is someone who doesn't have to put their hands on the equipment. They either have the staff to do that or they hire the staff to do that. They better know what can be accomplished. And as graphic systems get better, they better know what they can

accomplish in terms of graphics. As cameras get more refined, they better know that. As formats change, they better know that. As computers and video interface, they better know what they can accomplish. So that's not a question of being trained in the operations of it but being trained in the capabilities of it.

J. Brush relates all of this as she states:

What we tell the kids is that in corporate video or any area of corporate communications, you are going to be basically a corporate journalist so you need to have the same range of knowledge and skills -- plus the technological -- which must include a good liberal arts background.

Rice includes a couple of distinctions as to what one intends as a career in corporate video:

If somebody wants to be in the hands-on area, they want to be an engineer, an editor, a tape operator, a facilities manager, then they should take a standard RTF track. Now you've touched on one of my major soapboxes for the last 15 years. If someone is going to become a producer, if someone is going to become a writer, even if someone is going to become a director, I think the worst thing they could do is walk out of school with an RTF degree. I think they should get that business degree. I think you can learn what the equipment can accomplish on the job, but I don't think you can learn the concepts of the subject matter on the job.

Marlow responds with the same view:

Every year I take my radio students to WINS, a radio [station] here in New York, which is probably the most successful all-news radio station in the United States, in the largest metropolitan area. And every year a student raises the question of "if I wanted to be in radio how do I prepare to go to work for you?" And the general manager there -- a terrific guy -- always says "well don't get a degree in radio, don't get a degree in broadcast journalism, take liberal arts courses, take courses in history, in political science, in economics, in government, in all those kinds

of courses." And he said, "if you know how to write, we'll teach you how to write news for radio, but we can't teach you that stuff if you don't know what you're talking about."

D. Brush, explaining this overall strong writing and liberal arts background ability and how it should be applied in the corporate environment states, "as Jerry Nachman of the New York Post calls it, 'know your stuff.'" He continues:

Know what is going on in the world out there; know what it is about your company; be knowledgeable; be aware; be on top of social issues, political issues, environmental issues, business issues, and be able to then process all of those things into a concise communications package using any form of technology ranging from the written word to the visual image.

And what about continuing education after college? As Rice stated, "The surgeon who doesn't go back and study is going to be a pretty bad surgeon after 10 years out of school." When asked where a video professional could go for this training, he responded, "They can get it through industry seminars. There are plenty of training operations, educational processes, a number of equipment dealerships have their own training programs." As he continues:

I think someone can eventually find the ways to continue to learn. And there are different levels of learning. There's one thing which is keeping abreast of the technology, which can be done by reading, staying on top of the trades, picking up books as they come out, and continuing to digest that information.

Marlow also recognizes experience as education, "It's not just courses. It's really experience. It really has to do with experience, and some people really take to it and

there are some people that shouldn't be in the business in the first place." And what about motivation? He responds:

I think in any business, tenacity and will is 80 percent of the job and the rest of it is talent and background. It all has to do with the desire to do something. And if you see an opportunity that corporate television could fill [one needs to] go after making it happen -- and that has more to do with character than it does with background.

Today's corporate video department personnel have varied educational backgrounds, employment histories, sources of experience, and reasons for working in video. There isn't a single success formula for a career in video -- the corporate video field is too diverse -- so a broad base of education and background is recommended in order to cope with any challenge that a video professional may face. Yet the field is still as divided today as it was when it started. There are those who are in technical positions and those who are in nontechnical positions. Both of these groups should be familiar with how and what the other group does, but eventually one's video career is centralized around one of these groups. With equipment becoming digital, compact, and totally "user friendly," video technicians are becoming a much smaller group today, and nontechnical personnel are learning to connect equipment cables or turn on the auto level switches in order to accomplish their editing or production tasks.

The corporate video department is part of an overall business environment. Therefore, it is recommended that the

video professional understand that environment by taking business and organizational courses, such as business administration, political science, and other business/organization related subjects. The corporate video professional needs to understand both the politics and group dynamics of a business or corporation. Successful corporate video departments have personnel that are constantly continuing their education, keeping up-to-date on the latest technologies, and maintaining contacts with the rest of the nonbroadcast industry through professional associations and specialty group functions.

Manufacturers

Until recently, corporate video department needs were not a priority for the major equipment manufacturers; therefore, corporate or industrial users were left waiting for broadcast television equipment to "trickle down."

Each of the participants was asked if the video industry manufacturers were responsive or proactive to the needs of the corporate video department.

Rice responds:

Two weeks ago, I would have said responsive, at best. Corporate video has been adjunct to the real video world. The real video world is broadcast television. There's been a certain degree of responsiveness as certain elements come up -- certainly the high-end internal corporate facilities get served by a manufacturer when they call up and qualify themselves out of a 5-million dollar budget

and I am installing this kind of stuff and the salesman shows right up. But overall, all the products have been geared primarily to the broadcast industry. And they trickle down to corporate.

As he continues:

I heard that at a pre-NAB [1991] talk to the salesmen, Mark Grey, the president of some of the sales and marketing company, told the salesmen at the show 10 percent of the people coming into the booth this year are going to be broadcasters; it's the other 90 percent who are corporate, medical, cable, and they're the future of the company; they're the future of Sony.

Carlberg agrees as he responds, "I think ultimately they're going to be responsive to the marketplace. And there have been more lightweight cameras, more portable cameras, last longer on power. I remember when all I had was 15 minutes on a battery."

J. Brush states:

They have traditionally been reactive. I think though Sony is beginning to pick up on it as is Panasonic. We seem to be making some inroads in understanding what corporate video is. We've worked with these people -- D/J Brush and Sony go back to the First Brush Report, etc., and we're beginning to see some proactive but it's just beginning. They have claimed that they have been proactive for years, but they really haven't. They've pushed products out and then when the corporate video users have been enthusiastic or involved in using it or inventing new ways to use it, then they jumped on the bandwagon and they say "see we told you."

But she also defends manufacturers:

We've found individuals with Sony and Panasonic who are very attuned to corporate needs but by the time they fight the battles of their corporations, they often lose.

Reactive, proactive or responsive, it does not matter, according to Marlow:

What you are talking about has to do with the adoption of new technologies and price elasticity of demand. At one time computers such as ENIAC took up several rooms. It was hot and cost hundreds of thousands of dollars, but you can now the same technology in the palm of your hand. So ultimately all technologies have become accessible to the man on the street.

As he continues:

Now whether the larger manufacturers pay more attention to the consumer market than the corporate video market -- they're two different markets. They have their different demands. But the consumer market is definitely larger than the corporate television market. If you add in software sales, you're talking about a 17 billion dollar market in home video as compared to 6 billion dollars in the corporate nonbroadcast television market. So clearly, there's more dollars there. It all has to do with economics.

When asked for the difference between consumer and prosumer, Rice responds:

I think the real people who make video within a corporate structure are video professionals. And another line from NAB from one of the product managers at one of the major manufacturers said "I never had a customer walk up to me and say I am a prosumer." They want professional products.

As he continues:

There certainly is a merger of professional products and consumer products. Some companies which will put essentially the identical product-- one in a pro line, one in a consumer line-- but I think there is a real distinction in terms of the users who know if they are buying consumer to do it cheaply or if they are buying professional.

A change in the way manufacturers will direct their marketing is near as Rice states:

I think the corporate market is going to start to see products developed specifically for them as opposed to products that were recently developed for broadcast and were taken to the corporate market, when they got less expensive, when they got to be second, third and fourth generation product. And now you are going to see stuff going directly to the corporate market.

And as a result, the quality of corporate video standards will increase, as Carlberg states:

Well I think standards are going up as people move from productions houses in broadcast into corporate. I think it used to be that you could sell a bill of goods to somebody in corporate and some people did. And then there are other manufacturers who held out for high quality and I applaud them. But I think as people move over from production and broadcast into corporate, the standards are raised because they are demanding similar quality. So the marketplace is starting to demand it more.

Manufacturers are now beginning to address the nonbroadcast market as a separate market segment with needs and characteristics different from either the broadcast or consumer markets. In the past, corporate video, or the nonbroadcast industry, waited for broadcast products to become cheaper or consumer equipment to be upscaled with professional functions and connections. With the growth of nonbroadcast over broadcast in terms of equipment budget dollars, equipment is now being built with nonbroadcast specifications in mind. In terms of formats, both Hi-8,

developed by Sony, and S-VHS, marketed by Panasonic, JVC and others, demonstrate this new nonbroadcast market niche.

Associations

Professional associations for the corporate video department, such as ITVA, have also been reactive to the video department's needs. Professional associations are primarily useful as a networking tool for video/communication professionals, especially college graduates and recently for the growing field of independents or freelancer.

Again the participants were asked if they felt that professional video associations were responsive or reactive to their needs and if they offered sufficient leadership for their success.

Rice responds:

Real tough question. Comparison [Between NAB and ITVA]. National Association of Broadcasters [NAB] serves broadcasters. It is an industry from start to finish, which is of a like mind. We buy equipment. We make television programming. We broadcast television programming. We collect advertising revenues-- that's our business. Corporate video is not like that. As the case of the ITVA, which has its different special interest groups or it has manufacturing, it has area at scope, it has medical. It's real tough for an association to service corporate video as a single industry. It's also really diverse. One corporate video and one ITVA member could be the head of a 40-person department. The guy sitting next to him is an independent producer; so there's a difficulty there and I think because of the diversity it's very difficult for any association to serve all of its membership.

J. Brush states:

Well, I have mixed feelings about that. We've been involved with ITVA and EEI Audio Visual Committee and Audio Visual Managers Association [AVMA] and IABC and a raft of other organizations over the years -- AECT, ASTD, you know the whole alphabet soup of organizations. I don't personally feel that they attempt to give the leadership, because supposedly they are reflecting the needs of the organizations and the people that belong to their various groups.

As she continues:

Remember, all of the people with the exception of the executive director of the organization are volunteers. It's very difficult. And a couple people we know have gotten their head handed to them. And a number of these organizations I just mentioned were being probably too good of a leader of the organization itself and as a result neglecting the jobs that they are getting paid for.

After explaining the difficulties, J. Brush states, "So you can't fault them for being reactive. They are being reactive because that's what their membership wants. So it's easier to be reactive than to sit down and do these strategic plans for the organization you head."

Marlow felt that most professional video associations like ITVA supported the corporate video department, but there is a problem. He says, "Yeah. I would say so. The problem with the International Television Association [ITVA], and it is an inherent problem, is that no one in the business is competing for a regional or a national audience." Marlow continues:

You're dealing essentially with the epitome of a segmented market. It's an inherent problem that there are some common problems but again

it has to do with economic conditions. Someone out in the middle of Colorado working for a mining company is not worried about what his or her counterpart at another mining company in Colorado is producing. They are worried about just doing a good enough job to be able to survive in their organization. Now that's the problem.

Similarity, Carlberg responds, "I think ITVA, national/international, is extremely supportive and a very beneficial organization. I see the regional and local chapters as spotty. Some are just incredibly good and some don't quite live up to their term." What is missing or needed? He replied:

Well you know these days for one thing I think everybody is working. Any company that is successful, you don't have time and ITVA is one of those things that is easy to write off and say well I won't go to the meeting I've got to finish this proposal or something like that. It's an expendable thing. You are not paid to go there. You know if you've got to feed you family then you've got to do what you have to do to keep the paycheck coming.

J. Brush responded to the question of what the associations are doing, "There are always questionnaires going out from these organizations saying how can we best serve your needs. And obviously they have to rely on membership and dues, so the whole area is driven by what the needs are today."

D. Brush adds that the true benefit of these associations is "networking." He states:

It's quite a benefit to the junior people within the field who are fresh out of college or have one or two years' experience and are at the beginning to intermediate level. After an individual has achieved a certain level of competency and expertise as a manager or

producer, there's probably less value to ITVA. And of course one of the big things they keep promoting as its value is the networking aspect. That you can call a chapter chair in Seattle, for example, and say "hey I've got a shoot coming up there, who do you recommend that I get in touch with for a production house or a cameraman?" or something and the networking is very valuable.

J. Brush agreed as she states, "Networking is extremely important. I mean, we would not be able to do a job we're doing right now without the networking that we set up through ITVA and AVMA over the years." She also explains the importance of these contacts:

It's very easy to pick up your directory and as Doug said call somebody in a city or either you've met at a meeting or you know through some association contacts and say "hey, I need help or can you make a suggestion or I need to check somebody out" and they're there.

The changes in the corporate video industry have also forced associations to change accordingly. As Rice responds:

I think ITVA has been coming around lately. For a long time they fought the growth of the independent among the association. And now they are coming around. They are seeing their own figures as the growth of the independent explodes inside the association. For three reasons: number one, a lot of people who are coming up exclusively as independents that's all they have been in serving corporate video; number two, people who are coming out of network and broadcast television as that market shrinks and are finding a home in corporate video -- are finding a client base; and thirdly, probably most importantly, is those people who were corporate video departments who suddenly find themselves on the outside -- someone who is part of a 40-person staff, which gets cut back to 5, there are 35 people looking for work and a lot of them -- if not the majority of them stay in corporate video but as outside independent services.

Rice believes that even with all the changes, there could be more:

They, ITVA, could place a representative on an SMPTE committee. This gets into that whole philosophy that equipment that winds its way to the corporate market is second, third and fourth generation. Why do corporate people care about high-definition television? They are using 3/4. They are using 17-year-old technology. And it'll be hand-me-down. If the corporate industry stood up with a voice through an association or through some ad hoc level and said "we are going to be using high-definition," in fact, high-definition is a great example -- we may well be using high definition before the broadcasters start using high definition. "We want a voice. You have your needs and your requirements and the parameters you're going to impose upon this technology because of the way you need it to work for you. We have our own needs which may or may not jive with yours, but give us a voice in this." And I don't think that they're trying to do that at all.

One resource that video department managers use for outside support or professional networking is participation in various professional organizations. Joining associations such as ITVA provides membership directories for use both locally and when a client's project requires travel to unfamiliar destinations. Contacts through the membership directory do not guarantee access to a competent freelancer, but odds are that incompetent freelancers normally do not get recommended for jobs.

As far as other benefits from participation in professional video industry associations, few were mentioned, and reasons why ranged from the diversity of the membership served to the level of voluntary nature or unpaid national

leadership. Based on only a few paid office personnel, most professional associations rely on industry professionals to work their full-time jobs as well as lead regional and sometimes national association activities.

Future

In the year 2001, corporate video department functions may include touch screen database questionnaires and the daily use of live television with canned shows rolled in and more-- or maybe there won't be a corporate video department at all.

Participants were asked to predict the future of the corporate video department by describing the functions and department identity in the year 2001.

In response to the question of survival of the corporate video department until the year 2001, Rice states, "I hope so."

Whereas Carlberg responds, "I don't know. I think it still will be what a lot of them are -- visual communications or video departments. I think it will turn less away from tape and more toward live." As he continues:

But I would hope that the thrust will remain the same and that would be the same thrust that a good media department is today and that's being a problem solver -- you don't make TV programs, you solve problems -- communications problems.

When questioned on the future of the corporate video department Marlow states, "I think so yeah, except I don't think it's going to be videotape. I think it's all going to be digital and laser disk technology." He continues:

One of the problems with making predictions is that [they are] usually wrong. I used to hear things like that put forward by several consultants and writers of how it was all going to become part of management information, but that may or may not happen. I don't know. It's hard to predict what factors are going to come into play that might create a situation like that. I think it would be safe to say, and I am not trying to be safe, but it would be safe to predict that video communications are still going to be around in 10 years. Probably be around in 25 years. It's like saying that because video came along it didn't do away with print. There's more print in existence today, there are more books in existence today since the growth of television or radio. So they sort of helped each other grow. So I would say video communications will probably be around a lot more in the future than not. I think what is going to happen though is that we're going to sort of flip back, as Marshall McLuhan might have said, into corporations using live television instead of videotaped television. I think the growth of business television is going to occur now that satellite technology has become more and more accessible and corporations have a need for instant video communications à la J.C. Penney, and Merrill Lynch, and Federal Express and the whole lot of them. So I think you are going to see more of that, but that in turn will drive the need for canned video presentations that will become part of those presentations.

As for the affiliation or title of the corporate video department in the year 2001, Rice responds, "I hope it's corporate communications. I hope it's a really broad department where video is a centerpiece but not the end all

and be all of its output." And their major functions? He says:

Their major functions are to provide solutions to any communications needs that appear within any division or department of the company. And that video is one of many tools to have at their fingertips to provide those solutions.

And their major clients? Rice responds:

Their major clients are every single department in-house. I don't think there should be a delineation. I think if they are good they will find ways and they will attract each and every department to come to them to find ways to improve their operations. More realistically, their major clients are probably going to be PR and sales. Major clients, but there is absolutely no reason why a video department in the year 2001 can't have the personnel department as a major client. Why not be interviewing the applicants? Why not create a touch screen database questionnaire instead of an application? Why not provide a 15-minute briefing on the company for a new applicant -- someone who walks in for an interview and you may give them a brochure -- have them watch a videotape while they are waiting in the outside office.

In following up on what it would take to get the video department to the year 2001, Rice replies:

I think they need to stop thinking of themselves as television producers. I think they should stop thinking of themselves as people who are more closely akin to people working in broadcast network and cable television and start thinking of themselves as being more akin to the next vice president down the hall.

As Rice continues, "They shouldn't be forcing anybody to do anything that they don't really want to do in video. They shouldn't be focusing narrowly on tape pictures and sound as

the only communications process. They shouldn't be ignoring corporate cultures."

Marlow adds:

The simple answer is that they have to agree to the concept of personal growth. The really successful managers are the ones that keep looking beyond and keep growing themselves as individuals and as professionals and keep looking beyond their department and just keep on growing and become more sophisticated in every way they possibly can and to be as much as a professional as they can.

As Marlow continues to comment on the making of a successful video department:

It has to do with chemistry and it has to do with the level of professionalism of that individual running the department. Are they stuck where they are in their own growth professionally and personally or are they growing?

D. Brush responds with the most unexpected answer to the question of the corporate video department functions in the year 2001, "I don't think probably in 2001 you would be talking about corporate video at all." And do you agree? J. Brush responded, "Uh huh." Then what will we refer to video as? D. Brush responded, "We'll be talking about whatever generic term will be applied to the entire field of creating, producing, and distributing communications in any form or format. What that's going to be called we have no idea." Could it happen sooner? D. Brush states, "Possibly sooner, but certainly by 10 years."

As J. Brush explains:

Because again it's more technology driven at this point at least. If we become more

sophisticated in expressing our needs as corporate clients, then our needs grow and the technology is growing side by side with the needs. If you want to call it the next stage or the next generation, it's a whole new world out there.

The future for those departments that still exist by only doing corporate news video programming does not look promising. The corporate viewer is very familiar with the capabilities and uses of video, and the corporate video asset learning curve is beginning to level off. Better program distribution (i.e., digital computer screen video, in-house wireless transmission, distribution via AC circuit technology or everyday multi-point origination and distribution teleconferencing) is just around the corner and yet talking heads on the screen will look like talking heads no matter how it is distributed.

Computer-based training is taking business away from the once dominant video-based training. Computer groups that produce these training and marketing programs know more about video than corporate video departments know about computers. And just as desktop publishing has revolutionized the corporate printing world, so too will even a greater effect be felt by the corporate video department as desktop video becomes established.

Corporate video departments will experience greater changes in the 1990s with computers than those brought about in the 1970s with the videotape cassette. This time the result will mean more than better acquisition and distribution formats; computers will change the process and

function of video as we know it today. When this will happen is not definite, but video departments that can cope and make the transition to corporate communication problem solvers will survive and continue to grow as they have done in the past.

Summary

This chapter described the data collection process used for this research. Theme development and the method for coding and analyzing the data were reviewed. As a result of the data analysis, several themes were presented and supported with direct quotes by the transcribed interviews. Finally, a data interpretation was provided that summarized the compiled themes contained in this research. The next chapter will discuss the findings in greater detail as the themes are compared to the review of the literature for corporate video.

Chapter 4

Discussion

This chapter examines four areas. The first area covers how the analyzed data relate to the review of the literature. The second area contains additional observations made by the participants that did not surface as themes in the data analysis. The third area discloses limitations in the data collection method and other designs used in this research project. Finally, the fourth area focuses on considerations for further studies or projects relating to the corporate video department as a result of the findings in this research project.

Literature and the Data

The key difference between the findings in the review of the literature on corporate video and the data analysis in this study hinges on recency. As is the case with most written material, there is a delay from when the author conducts research, records and edits thoughts, and then completes the work for publishing. It may take several months and even years for the collected data to be published. Therefore, the review of the literature, based on written and published material spanning many years, could not possibly reveal the current material gained from the qualitative, depth interviews used in this current research project. Time is an important factor in the study of the corporate video

department because the video department function is changing rapidly. Even the Brush Reports, published on the state of the nonbroadcast television industry about every four or five years, are often outdated before their publication date and therefore require an updated supplement to be printed which outline the recent changes in the industry.

Desktop video or digital video is currently one of the causes for the fast-paced changes. The literature mentions digital video as a future development, but the interviews clearly demonstrate that digital video is here today. Just as the need for effective training and marketing programs caused the burst of growth in the corporate video department, so too is the demand today for effective multimedia nonlinear video and computer-graphic-based training, sales reporting, and employee information programs. Will the corporate video department be able to react as it did in the 1970s? The interviewees' future predictions suggest that the department will be able to react if major changes in video departments' form and function are realized. Even then, the corporate video department's identity would not be recognized compared to current standards. The literature and research data confirm that the corporate video industry is growing, but the data suggest that the industry growth is occurring more within outside video production companies and freelancers than within in-house corporate video departments -- a direct result of almost 10 years of cutbacks in corporate video departments. Video departments have been able to expand

their capabilities and staffing by hiring outside support services and freelancers to support functions on an as-needed basis.

Research data suggest that the level of experience and talent within typical corporate video departments has led video managers to go outside for more experienced and talented producers, directors, and technicians. The lack of growth within the video department and, to some degree its demise, can be attributed to the fact that the corporate video producer can often find better and cheaper video support and services outside the department. Not only is the commercial broadcast industry feeding the talent pool with these experienced professionals, but so are the corporate video professionals who leave to start their own production companies and take years of video experience away from their corporate video department.

The literature describes the corporate video manager as a captain who keeps the corporate video department ship afloat. Through cutbacks, lay-offs and mergers, the video manager does all he/she can to stay in the black or at least not go in the red more than last year. The research data suggest that there is little left of the video department to trim and the video manager should be, or should soon start, looking for another "ship." The new "ship" should take on new functions and become a communication source where video is only part of a more comprehensive function. The interviews depict a successful video department with these

traits: not advocating video as the ultimate solution, understanding the objectives of the corporation, and being cost effective.

There were two areas that the review of the literature failed to mention. The first is the impact that manufacturers like SONY, JVC, and Panasonic have on corporate video departments. And the second - what the effects, if any, that large professional associations have on corporate video departments. Because of the lack of information on these topics, this study contained questions aimed at providing some insight.

The data support the notion that change is coming and that manufacturers are beginning to address the real needs of the corporate video department, not just modifying broadcast and consumer equipment for industrial use. The change is a result of market share, and the segment with the largest combined budget receives the attention and product development support from the major manufacturers. The broadcast television market no longer holds share dominance. According to the data, nonbroadcast television, as a whole, spends more budget dollars and soon, if not already, one will see equipment aimed directly at the industrial user.

The data provided significant insights into the strengths and weaknesses of professional associations such as ITVA. First, associations have been reactive to the needs of the corporate video department, providing more of a networking function among professionals than a strong voice

or leadership in the industry. Although membership numbers have leveled off, the number of independents or freelancers is increasing rapidly. As a result, the value of contacts through networking opportunities is proving to be an asset provided by the larger associations.

As for weaknesses, the data clearly demonstrate a lack of leadership within the associations for the video industry as a whole. As an example, ITVA, which has a small number of paid staff positions, cannot possibly provide the needed leadership for all its members. From the viewpoint of the association's leaders, it is difficult to be a strong association president with a membership of 10,000+ and still maintain a full-time job. More paid positions are needed within the associations if they are to provide a greater benefit for corporate video departments. The additional professional leadership could provide more training seminars and career guidance as well as lobby for the entire nonbroadcast industry in matters such as HDTV and other technologies that will determine the future of its members.

The future for the corporate video department, as depicted by the literature, is hopeful, and awaits the next technology development to launch it ahead into the next decade. The interviews indicate that the next technology is here - computers. Those who understand and control computers may control the video department of the future. In the meantime, computers are beginning to play key roles in every aspect of today's corporate video department. From computer-

based library inventories to computer-based editing workstations, computers are vital to the corporate video department. Computer-based digital video is moving ahead and currently there are three groups that the data suggest are in position to control it, and with it the video programming for the corporation. The groups are telecommunications (due to their association with video teleconferencing systems that use telecommunication facilities for transmission); Management Information Systems (MIS) (divisions that are being created within organizations to manage digital data (i.e., digital video) storage and retrieval); and the corporate video or media departments. The interviewees agreed that no matter which group gained control of this new medium, one would not recognize it by using today's corporate video department as a comparative standard.

Participants' Observations

Broadcasting Versus Corporate

Although the participants' data were collected and analyzed for common themes, there were a few notable observations that relate to the corporate video department's struggle for success that need to be mentioned.

The first observation came from both Rice and Carlberg. They both commented on how corporate video professionals make the mistake of acting like broadcast professionals. The reason according to Carlberg is "...well there's a certain

romance and adventure inherent in broadcasting. I started in radio and I really enjoyed it. There's a certain spontaneity, a live aspect of the business, that you just don't always get in corporate. You know each has its strengths in terms of its appeal."

Rice explains the difference:

I think they need to stop thinking of themselves as television producers. I think they should stop thinking of themselves as people who are more closely akin to people working in broadcast network and cable television and start thinking of themselves as being more akin to the next vice president down the hall.

Although corporate and broadcasting television share the same technologies, their goals and functions are completely different. The commercial programming effort in broadcasting is quite different than the information and training programming objectives in corporate television.

Profit Centers

Many corporate video managers suggest that the key to bringing the video department out of the red is to take on outside work. But as J. Brush comments:

That is always a very, very difficult issue to handle, because we have recommended against doing outside work to most of our clients. There are those who can handle it but most cannot, because you are trying to serve two masters.

J. Brush continues by stating that unless one has the total agreement of top management, when one is working with outside clients and something arises in which management

needs the department's services, that they not complain. "But most corporations don't understand and put themselves in a real bind by trying to take in other people's work and then trying to manage their own projects as well."

Rice agrees:

And a lot of companies which have opened big and expansive places and have then cut them back or have opened big places and management says it's a sponge that is just sucking up money. And then they open them up and try to make them commercial and bring in outside clientele, which I don't think I've ever seen work successfully.

Charge-Back Systems

Charge back systems are designed differently depending on the corporation. Some corporations give the video department a yearly budget with zero charge-back to the group that uses the video department. Most companies use a charge-back system that keeps accounting tabs on all charges incurred to that video production, including stock and postage costs, and then bills the group requesting the video project for these charges. According to Carlberg, "There has been a big debate on charge back systems. I don't like them myself in general. I've not seen a charge back system that hasn't caused hard feelings or turned producers or managers into accountants instead of TV people."

Hiring Freelancers

In determining staff support needs, Rice suggests that the staff functions be divided into two groups - above-the-line and below-the-line. First, above-the-line personnel are those that a department can afford to hire on a full-time basis and will hold their value within the corporation. For example, a full-time producer is going to learn the corporate culture, know the company philosophy, and be much more of a company expert on various video projects. The technical support staff that assists an in-house producer would be considered below-the-line or part-time personnel because a department could not afford to keep them working on in-house projects full-time and they would be hired as needed. Rice recommended that the corporate video department's first above-the-line hire be a producer, then a writer, with additional full-time above-the-line hires made as needed.

Limitations of the Study

The limitations of this research, as are those of most other studies, became apparent as the study progressed. At first, the researcher tries to build in measures and guides for a perfect study, but there is no such thing as a perfect study.

Indeed this study was not perfect, because there were too many variables at work and as always time and resources were limited. Even in the process of data collection, the lack of certain resources immediately indicated the

limitations of this study. The lack of financial resources was a major factor in the selection of the interview style for this research. In order to record facial and nonverbal responses for later data analysis, on-site field interviews would have been more effective than the phoned depth interviews used. The number of participants was also a key limitation to this study, although a careful selection of the participants was made to avoid this limitation.

The amount of collected data determined this study's next limitation: the difficulty of accessing the data and exposing its meaning. The limitation of a single researcher on this project also affected the data interpretation, for one person cannot interpret something that he/she does not understand or find to exist. An advantage of the use of only one researcher for a qualitative study however, was efficiency. Because there was no need to explain personal notes and data analysis to other assistants, this researcher was able to maintain complete control over a complex personalized coding process. Therefore, it took less time to interpret and analyze the data.

One final limitation was that the subject of the study (the corporate video department) does not have a norm as to its size, function, or mission. This point became obvious when asking the participants to identify the stage of development that the corporate video department is in today. Each participant had his/her own conceptualization of a

corporate video department and was influenced by his/her own experiences and knowledge of other departments.

Directions for Future Research

Every researcher says that future research is needed, and this researcher follows that model. The future research on this topic should not focus on the corporate video department and how it copes with an identity crisis in changing times. Instead, future research should focus on the technologies that force that identity crisis.

This research examined what the corporate video department did to survive major changes in the late 1980s and early 1990s. But the key to continued success in the late 1990s and beyond is to understand that technologies are not the reasons for a video department's success, but rather are just the current tools available for use at the time. The participants in this study were concerned about who would control the communication technology of the future, and yet they believe today that we should prepare our corporate video departments to understand the business and purpose of communication within the corporation regardless of the technology at hand. The departments that are taking on this new mission will be here in 10 years, but there are many who will not exist because of the shortsighted goals of video department managers and corporate executives.

This research also suggests that larger video industry associations produce video reports or teleconferences and

distribute them to their members. There exist several examples of opportunities and pitfalls experienced by corporate video departments from which other corporate video departments could learn. The journals only skim the surface with short articles highlighting tips for success and reports displaying a very optimistic, "all is great, because there is growth in the video industry" attitude - possibly done to appease its advertisers. A yearly video program or teleconference could provide a current status of the industry, which could include model departments, career guidance, and programming suggestions for corporate video professionals and those interested in entering the nonbroadcast field.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, J. A. (1987). Communication research: Issues and Methods. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Babbie, E. R. (1983). The practice of social research (3rd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Co.
- Barr, S. (1990). Where does video fit in the communication mix? Corporate Video Decisions, 3 (8), 28.
- Bogdan, R., & Taylor, S. J. (1975). Introduction to qualitative research methods : A phenomenological approach to the social sciences. New York: Wiley.
- Brush, J. M., & Brush, D. P. (1974). Private television communications: A report to management. White Plains, NY: Knowledge Industry Publications.
- _____, J. M., & Brush, D. P. (1977). Private television communications: An awakening giant. Boston: Herman Publishing.
- _____, J. M., & Brush, D. P. (1986). Private television communications: The new directions (The Fourth Brush Report). Cold Spring, NY: H I Press.
- _____, J. M., & Brush, D. P. (1988). Private television communications: The Fourth Brush Report; Update '88. LaGrangeville, NY: H I Press.
- Burgess, R. G. (1984). In the field: An introduction to field research. Boston: George Allen & Unwin.
- Carlberg, S. (1991). Corporate video survival. White Plains, NY: Knowledge Industry Publications.
- Cantor, M. G. (1987). Commentary on qualitative research and mediated communications in subcultures and institutions. In T.R. Lindlof (Ed.), Natural audiences: Qualitative research of media uses and effects. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Company.
- Cochran, D. S., & Dolan, J. A. (1984). Qualitative research: An alternate to quantitative research in communication. Journal of Business Communication, 21(4), 25-32.

- Dabbs, J. M. (1982). Making things visible. In J. Van Maanen, J.M. Dabbs, Jr., & R.R. Faulkner, Varieties of qualitative research. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Das, T. H. (1983). Qualitative Research in organizational behaviour. Journal of Management Studies (Oxford, England), 20(7), 301-14.
- Dranov, P., Moore, L. & Hickey, A. (1982). Nonbroadcast television. The video age: Television technology and applications in the 1980s. White Plains, NY: Knowledge Industry Publications.
- _____, P., Moore, L. & Hickey, A. (1982). Corporate television. The video age: Television technology and applications in the 1980s. White Plains, NY: Knowledge Industry Publications.
- Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company.
- Isaac, S. & Michael, W.B. (Eds.). (1984). Handbook in research and evaluation: A collection of principles, methods, and strategies useful in planning, design, and evaluation of studies in education and the behavioral sciences (2nd ed.). San Diego, CA: Edits.
- Jones, S. (1985). Depth interviewing. In R.L. Walker (Ed.), Applied qualitative research. Aldershot, Hants, England : Brookfield, VT, U.S.A. : Gower.
- _____, S. (1985). The analysis of depth interviews. In R.L. Walker (Ed.), Applied qualitative research. Aldershot, Hants, England : Brookfield, VT, U.S.A.: Gower.
- Jurek, K. (1989). Careers in video. White Plains, NY: Knowledge Industry Publications.
- Kirk, J. & Miller, M. L. (1986). Reliability and validity in qualitative research. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Lindlof, T. R. & Meyer, T. P. (1987). Mediated communications as ways of seeing, acting, constructing culture: The tools and foundations of qualitative research. In T.R. Lindlof (Ed.), Natural audiences: Qualitative research of media

- uses and effects. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Company.
- Manen, M. van. (1990). Researching lived experience: human science for an action sensitive pedagogy. Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press.
- Marlow, E. (1989). Managing corporate media. White Plains, NY: Knowledge Industry Publications.
- Miles, M. B. & Huberman, M. (1984). Qualitative data analysis: a sourcebook of new methods. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Mishler, E. G. (1986). Research interviewing: context and narrative. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Moran, W. T. (1986). The science of qualitative research. Journal of Advertising Research, 26(4), RC16-RC19.
- Morton-Williams, J. (1985). Making qualitative research work: Aspects of administration. In R.L. Walker (Ed.), Applied qualitative research. Aldershot, Hants, England : Brookfield, VT, U.S.A. : Gower.
- Mulligan, S. (1986). Foreward: "Beam me up Scotty". In J.M. Brush and D.P. Brush, Private television communications: The new directions (The Fourth Brush Report). Cold Spring, NY: H I Press.
- Rice, J. (1989). John Rice: The corporate view - The drive to 10,000. Corporate Television, 3 (5), 8.
- Schatzman, L. & Strauss, A. L. (1973). Field research: Strategies for a natural sociology. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Schindler, S. (1989). Getting down to business: A survey of the equipment that has revolutionized corporate video. Videography, 14 (1), 41-42.
- Selvin, H. C. (1979). On following in someone's footsteps: Two examples of Lazarsfeldian methodology. In R.K. Merton. J.J. Coleman & P.H. Rossi (Eds.), Qualitative and quantitative social research: Papers in honor of Paul F. Lazarsfeld. New York: Free Press.
- Soseman, N. (1990). Look out for that bandwagon! Video Systems, 16 (12), 4.

- Stokes, J. T. (1988). The business of nonbroadcast television: Corporate and institutional video budgets, facilities, and applications. White Plains, NY: Knowledge Industry Publications.
- Tauber, E. M. (1987). Qualitative vs. quantitative. Journal of Advertising Research, 27(4), 7.
- Van Maanen, J., Dabbs, Jr., J. M., & Faulkner, R. R., (1982). Varieties of qualitative research. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Walker, R. L. (Ed.) (1985). Applied qualitative research. Aldershot, Hants, England : Brookfield, VT, U.S.A.: Gower.
- Weller, S. C. & Romney, A. K. (1988). Systematic data collection. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.